

DMDC Report No. 97-013
October 1997



A Study of Schools Serving Military Families in the U.S.

Education Quality, Federal Administration,
and Funding



Defense Manpower Data Center
Survey & Program Evaluation Division
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400
Arlington, VA 22209-2593

For additional copies of this report,

contact:

Defense Technical Information Center

ATTN: DTIC-BRR

Defense Document Information Center

8725 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite #0944

Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

(703) 767-8274

Ask for Report by ADA-372911

A STUDY OF SCHOOLS SERVING MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE U.S.

EDUCATION QUALITY, FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION, AND FUNDING

**John Helmick, Westat, Inc. and
Lisa Hudson, Defense Manpower Data Center**

**Defense Manpower Data Center
Survey & Program Evaluation Division
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 400, Arlington, VA 22209-2593**

Acknowledgments

This study was made possible by the many DDESS school administrators and teachers, state and local education administrators, military installation personnel, and military parents who took valuable time to provide us with information and insight concerning each DDESS site and local school district. The authors thank them for their patience and hospitality.

The authors particularly wish to thank the DDESS superintendents and their staffs for coordinating the site visits and scheduling the many interviews and parent meetings. Special thanks to Don Dorton, Quantico DDESS superintendent, and Dennis Jarret of the York County, Virginia, school system, for their assistance in pretesting the two parent surveys.

This study benefited immeasurably from the work that has come before it. The authors gratefully acknowledge the prior studies on the DDESS transfer issue conducted by the RAND Corporation and the U.S. General Accounting Office. These studies, cited throughout this report, provided a solid foundation from which to build our efforts.

Thanks also to John Forkenbrock, Executive Director of the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools; John Deegan, Executive Director of the Military Impacted Schools Association; and Gregg Spencer of the U.S. Department of Education's Impact Aid Office. Each of these individuals provided needed information on the functioning and funding of the Impact Aid program.

The efforts of several Westat staff members are gratefully acknowledged. Elizabeth Farris and Laurie Lewis designed the two parent surveys and all the interview protocols. Dave Becher accomplished all planned and unplanned data analyses in record time. Beth Sinclair traveled to each DDESS site, conducted most of the interviews with the local school district superintendents, and prepared nearly all the initial drafts of the site visits. Ted Shen helped draft the analysis of the LEA parent survey and Impact Aid funding data. David Morganstein, Daniel Levine, and Pam Broene provided statistical support for drawing the two parent samples and weighting the survey data. Mary Ann Deak patiently produced the many report drafts and re-drafts. Mike Wilson contributed technical advice on our analytical focus. We especially thank Ronie Nieva for her corporate oversight of the project and review of the final report document.

Numerous Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) associates also helped gather and analyze the data presented in this report. Special thanks are due to Jack Edwards for his help with all aspects of the study, particularly with sharpening the focus of the report. In addition, the staff at Data Recognition Corporation have our appreciation for their able assistance with the survey data collections. Photos on the covers of this report and the surveys are used courtesy of the Department of Education.

Finally, the authors are grateful to Linda Renz and Hector Nevarez of the Department of Defense Education Activity for their guidance and support throughout the study.

John Helmick
Lisa Hudson

Executive Summary

This report describes a study of two Federally funded programs that provide for the elementary and secondary education of military dependents who live in the United States. One program, the Department of Defense (DoD) Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS), provides education for children living on military installations that are adjacent to communities where the local schools had at one time been deemed unable to provide a “suitable” education. The other program complements the DDESS program; it supports the education of military dependents in communities where these children are educated in the local public schools. The second program is run by the U.S. Department of Education and provides Federal “Impact Aid” funds to local educational agencies (LEAs) that educate the children of military personnel. Impact Aid funding compensates LEAs for the loss of revenues resulting from the tax-exempt status of both Federal property and the personal property of military personnel.

The study was conducted in response to the Conference Report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law No. 103-337). This report requested that the Secretary of Defense conduct a survey of DDESS to collect information concerning the possibility of transferring the DDESS schools to LEAs. In addition, the Secretary was requested to survey LEAs with over 30-percent military-connected student populations to determine the level and sources of funding for these LEAs. The report also asked that both surveys include an examination of military parents’ perspectives on the quality of education provided by the DDESS or LEA schools.

DDESS School Quality

Parents’ opinions regarding the quality of DDESS schools were collected using a mailed survey. The *Survey of Parents’ Opinions on Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools* (the *DDESS Survey*) was sent to a random sample of parents with children attending, in school year 1995-96, any of the 59 DDESS schools located on 15 military installations within the United States.

Parents with children enrolled in the DDESS schools have a high opinion of the quality of education provided by these schools. Parents rated the schools most highly in terms of instructional quality, the safety and discipline provided by the schools, and the schools’ encouragement of parent involvement in their child’s learning. Relative to their opinions of U.S. public schools in general, DDESS parents had higher opinions of the quality of the DDESS schools. Moreover, DDESS parents rated these schools more highly than parents in other surveys rated their own child’s public school. Part of the reason DDESS schools are rated so highly appears to be that they function as neighborhood schools that serve only military dependents, similar to “coterminous” LEAs (LEAs with boundaries that are the same as the boundaries of a military installation). These higher ratings also may reflect other quality advantages provided by DDESS schools. In addition, given parents’ awareness of the potential for a transfer of the DDESS schools to LEAs, these ratings may partially reflect parents’ opposition to a transfer.

Transfer of DDESS Schools to LEAs

Opinions regarding the possible transfer of DDESS schools to LEAs were collected using a combination of methods. The *DDESS Survey* asked parents for their opinions regarding transferring DDESS schools to local public school districts. During on-site interviews, commanders of the 15 installations with DDESS schools and superintendents of the 15 DDESS systems were asked for their opinions on the transfer issue. Finally, superintendents of the 24 LEAs adjacent to a DDESS school and

their corresponding state education officials were also interviewed regarding (a) their opinions on transfer, (b) conditions that would need to be met to facilitate a transfer, and (c) their perceptions about who is responsible for the education of military-connected students.

Parents of DDESS students strongly and overwhelmingly oppose transferring DDESS schools to the local public school districts. Opposition increased with the parents' rank, the perceived relative quality of the DDESS schools compared to the local public schools, and parent concern over transfer issues other than educational quality (e.g., student safety and busing/loss of neighborhood schools). Parents whose children had not attended any public schools were also more opposed to a transfer than were parents whose children had attended public schools.

Parents have many concerns about a possible transfer. Student safety, inability of the local schools to meet the special needs of military children, and the possibility of busing or the loss of neighborhood schools topped the list, followed by concerns related to school quality (e.g., instructional quality). Among parents of special needs students, the availability of special education programs was also a major concern.

In their interviews, the installation command and DDESS personnel expressed similar views to those of DDESS parents. The interviewed personnel typically opposed a transfer; they believed that a transfer would sacrifice education quality, attention to the needs of military children, and the strong links between DDESS schools and both installation services and the chain of command. Further, installation commanders feared that the loss of DDESS schools would be viewed as a degradation of current quality-of-life programs at their installation.

Interviewed officials from all LEAs that are eligible to receive the DDESS students were willing to accept responsibility for these students, provided that adequate Federal funding is available. There was, however, widespread skepticism among LEA officials about the adequacy of Impact Aid funding. In the event of a transfer, all LEAs would require use of the existing DDESS facilities (or construction of new facilities). General transfer issues that would need to be addressed include LEA acquisition or ownership of DDESS facilities, the condition of DDESS facilities, and personnel issues related to the transition of Federal DDESS personnel to the state and LEA systems. Many LEA officials also requested that the Federal government provide transition funding to cover the initial costs of a transfer, as well as additional funding (beyond Impact Aid) to handle the increased student population that would result from a transfer and/or to cover capital outlays for the facilities that would house the new students. Additional logistical, administrative, or legal issues would need to be addressed at specific sites. For example, at five installations, more than one LEA could claim jurisdictional responsibility for the DDESS students. At installations with restricted access, LEA access to on-base school facilities may require special arrangements.

Education Quality in Impact Aid LEAs

The Impact Aid portion of this study focused on LEAs in which over 30 percent of enrolled students are military connected. In school year 1995-96, 93 LEAs in 34 states met this criterion. Parents' opinions regarding the quality of education provided by schools in these LEAs were collected using a mailed survey. The *Department of Defense Survey of Parents' Opinions on Local Schools* (the *LEA Survey*) was administered to a random sample of military parents who (a) had a school-aged child and (b) lived in an area served by any of the 93 target LEAs.

Ratings given by military parents to the quality of education in the LEAs were generally favorable and in line with ratings given by parents of public school children in the nation as a whole. As in the

DDESS Survey, military parents in these LEAs rated the schools most highly in terms of instructional quality, safety and discipline, and encouragement of parent involvement in their child's learning. The *LEA Survey* found relatively low levels of satisfaction with schools' responsiveness to the needs of military students and with parents' voice in decisions regarding their child's educational programs. These findings suggest that these target LEAs provide a good general education, but lack the focus on military families that is provided by schools (such as DDESS) that serve exclusively military-connected students.

Funding of Impact Aid LEAs

Information regarding LEA funding was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education's *Common Core of Data*. In addition, telephone interviews were conducted with superintendents of the 93 target LEAs and with their corresponding state education officials. These interviews focused on views regarding responsibility for educating military-connected students and on education funding issues.

States and their LEAs often disagree on who—local, state, and/or Federal governments—is responsible for the education of military-connected students. Most target LEAs and their states are ready to assume at least some of this responsibility. Nonetheless, one half of the target LEAs and over one third of the target states felt that the Federal government bears some responsibility for the education of students who live on military installations. These opinions were based primarily on financial rather than legal considerations. Both LEA and state officials viewed Federal Impact Aid as the appropriate program for the Federal government to meet this financial responsibility.

Since the early 1980s, the Impact Aid program has been funded well below the maximum authorized levels. In Fiscal Year 1995, the program was funded at 53 percent of the maximum authorized. Although recent Defense drawdowns and military base closures may have alleviated some of the Impact Aid funding shortfalls, many LEA officials felt that Impact Aid funding levels have failed to keep pace with the increasing costs of educating students. In addition to funding levels, nearly three fourths of the LEA officials expressed concern over the reliability and timing (non-forward funding) of Impact Aid funds.

The target LEAs in this study rely on Impact Aid to make up for reduced local contributions from military personnel. It is thus not surprising that these target LEAs receive proportionately more of their education funding from Federal sources and less from local sources, relative to other LEAs. These LEAs, however, receive proportionately less funding from Federal and local sources *combined* than do other LEAs, suggesting that Federal funding increases are not fully compensating these LEAs for local decreases. Also, the target LEAs' average per-pupil expenditure level is lower than both the national average and the average for their states. These findings are consistent with the view that the Federal government is not fully meeting its financial responsibility to assist with the public education of military-connected students.

Conclusions

This study found strong support for the current DDESS system among the parents of DDESS students, installation commanders, and DDESS personnel. These strong endorsements and corresponding opposition to DDESS transfer can be easily understood in light of the (perceived) advantages provided by the DDESS system to military children and parents (e.g., an education system exclusively focused on military children, strong links to base services and command structure, a safe environment).

Although they do not actively seek a transfer of DDESS schools to LEAs, state and local education officials are open to a transfer, as long as the Federal government provides sufficient funding. Transferring the DDESS schools to LEAs would involve considerable cost to the LEAs and/or Federal government, both

for the short-term transition period, as well as for the long term. Logistical arrangements regarding facilities, personnel, and transportation, among others, would also need resolution. None of these factors pose insurmountable impediments to transfer.

Notwithstanding the strong opposition to transfer uncovered in this study, continuation of the current DDESS system is more difficult to justify now than in the past. Ultimately, the main arguments for and against a transfer involve a trade-off between financial considerations and the perceived value of the DDESS schools to military personnel. These two issues must be carefully weighed in the context of budgetary priorities and military quality-of-life decisions. Assuming that a transfer of the DDESS schools may eventually be required, this report suggests that such transfers be carefully and strategically planned.

The second major issue addressed in this study was funding for LEAs with enrollments that are over 30 percent military-connected students. These LEAs must rely on Federal Impact Aid to offset shortfalls in their education budgets resulting from the presence of military-connected students. Most LEA officials surveyed in this study felt that because Impact Aid was currently funded at less than maximum authorized levels, it did not provide sufficient reimbursement to offset this burden.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
The DDESS Schools	2
History of the DDESS System.....	2
The Current DDESS System	3
Previous Studies of DDESS Transfer	4
Impact Aid	6
Rationale for Impact Aid Funds.....	6
History of Impact Aid	7
Impact Aid Funding Levels.....	8
DoD Supplemental Funds.....	8
Current Funding Allocations.....	9
Chapter 2: Study Methodology.....	11
Data Collection for DDESS Schools	11
DDESS Parent Survey	12
Site Visits	12
Telephone Interviews with State Education Officials	13
Data Collection for Impact Aid LEAs	13
LEA Parent Survey	14
Telephone Interviews with LEA Officials.....	15
Telephone Interviews with State Education Officials	16
Analytic Approach for Parent Surveys	16
Weighting Procedures.....	16
Parent Subgroups.....	17
Chapter 3: Parents’ Views on DDESS School Quality	19
Opinions about DDESS Schools	19
General Characterizations of the School.....	19
Parents’ Voice in School Decisions.....	20
Availability of DDESS Schools as a Reason for Living on Military Installation.....	21
Parents’ Evaluation of DDESS Education Programs	22
Overall Findings.....	22
Subgroup Analyses	23
DDESS Parents’ Quality Ratings in Perspective.....	25
DDESS Parents’ Ratings of DDESS, Local, and U.S. Schools.....	26
Quality Ratings from Three Surveys.....	26
Quality Ratings for DDESS and LEA Subgroups	27
Summary	28

Table of Contents (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 4: Parents' Views on Transfer of DDESS Schools.....	31
General Position Regarding Transfer.....	31
Overall Findings.....	31
Subgroup Findings	31
Parents' Concerns about a Transfer	32
Overall Findings.....	32
Subgroup Findings	34
Factors Related to Position on Transfer.....	34
School Quality and Position on Transfer.....	34
General Factors Related to Position on Transfer	36
Summary.....	37
Chapter 5: DDESS Quality and Transfer by Installation.....	39
DDESS Survey Findings	39
Parents' Opinions on School Quality	39
Parents' Position on Transfer	40
Parents' Concerns Regarding Transfer.....	41
Factors Explaining Installation Differences on Transfer Position.....	41
State, Local, and Installation Views on Transfer.....	43
General Opinions	44
Generic Transfer Issues.....	45
Site-specific Transfer Issues	48
The Individual DDESS Systems.....	49
Fort McClellan, Alabama	49
Fort Rucker, Alabama.....	51
Maxwell AFB, Alabama.....	51
Fort Benning, Georgia.....	52
Fort Stewart, Georgia.....	52
Robins AFB, Georgia.....	53
Fort Campbell, Kentucky	53
Fort Knox, Kentucky.....	54
West Point (United States Military Academy), New York	54
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	55
Fort Bragg, North Carolina	55
Fort Jackson, South Carolina.....	56
Laurel Bay MCB, South Carolina	56
Dahlgren NSWC, Virginia	56
Quantico MCB, Virginia	57
Summary.....	57

Table of Contents (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 6: Military Parents’ Views on LEA School Quality.....	61
Opinions about LEA Schools	61
General Characterizations of LEA Schools	61
Parents’ Voice in School Decisions	62
Parents’ Evaluation of LEA Education Programs	63
Overall Findings.....	63
Subgroup Analyses	63
LEA Parents’ Quality Ratings in Perspective	65
Summary.....	66
Chapter 7: Funding of Impact Aid LEAs	67
The Education of Military-connected Students.....	67
Responsibility for Educating Military-connected Students	67
Problems Faced in Educating Military-connected Students	71
Impact Aid Funding.....	72
Reliability and Timing of Impact Aid Funding	72
Impact Aid Funding Levels.....	73
DoD Supplemental Funds.....	75
Overall LEA Funding	76
LEA Funding Sources	76
LEA Funding Levels	78
Impact Aid as Compensation for Reduced Local Contribution.....	78
Summary.....	80
Chapter 8: Findings and Conclusions	83
The DDESS Schools	83
Findings Concerning Education Quality	83
Findings Concerning Transfer.....	84
Transfer Pros and Cons.....	84
Conditions for Transfer	87
Conclusions	88
Impact Aid LEAs	89
Findings Concerning Education Quality	89
Findings Concerning the Responsibility to Educate Military-connected Students.....	89
Findings Concerning Funding	89
Conclusions	90
References	93

Table of Contents (Continued)

Page

Appendices

APPENDIX A: Annotated Bibliography	A-1
APPENDIX B: Questionnaire for Survey of Parents' Opinions on Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools	B-1
APPENDIX C: DDESS State and Local Interview Protocols	C-1
APPENDIX D: Questionnaire for Department of Defense Survey of Parents' Opinions on Local Schools	D-1
APPENDIX E: LEA State and Local Interview Protocols	E-1
APPENDIX F: Additional Chapter Tables	F-1
APPENDIX G: Site Visit Reports	G-1
APPENDIX H: State Interview Reports.....	H-1
APPENDIX I: Report Documentation Page	I-1

Chapter 1: Introduction

This study focuses on two Federally funded programs that provide for the elementary and secondary education of military dependents living in the United States. One program, the Department of Defense (DoD) Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS), provides education for military dependents living on military installations in communities where the local schools had at one time been deemed unable to provide a “suitable” education.¹ The other program complements the DDESS program, by supporting the education of military dependents in localities where these children are educated in the local public schools. The second program is run by the U.S. Department of Education and provides “Impact Aid” funds to local educational agencies (LEAs).² Impact Aid funding compensates LEAs for the loss of revenues resulting from the tax-exempt status of military property.

This study was conducted in response to the House Conference Report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law No. 103-337), H.R. REP. No 701, 103rd Cong., 2nd Sess (1994). The Conference Report requested that the Secretary of Defense collect information concerning the possibility of transferring the DDESS schools to LEAs. The Report asked that the data collection include:

(1) the opinions and attitudes of the parents of the students enrolled in the schools regarding the quality of education programs and transfer of DoD domestic dependent schools to LEAs; (2) the positions of the LEAs and appropriate education officials of the state in which the school is located regarding the responsibility of LEAs to educate military-connected students who reside on military installations, including the financial and legal basis for those positions; and (3) the positions of the LEAs and appropriate educational officials of the state in which the school is located regarding the transfer of DoD domestic dependent schools to LEAs, including requirements of the LEAs and state education authorities for financial, military construction, and other support needed to facilitate transfer of the schools to the LEAs. (p. 693)

The Conference Report also requested that the Secretary gather data on school districts operated by LEAs with military-connected student populations of over 30 percent; these LEAs rely heavily on Impact Aid funding. This effort was to include:

(1) the previous level of financial support of DoD and other Federal agencies, and the timing of political and fiscal decisions concerning the education of military-connected students; (2) the positions of the LEAs and education officials of the state in which the school district is located regarding the responsibility of LEAs to educate military-connected students who reside on military installations, including the financial and legal basis for those positions and the officials’ awareness of differences in Federal contributions to dependent education between DoD domestic dependent schools and Department of Education impact aid; (3) an analysis of the funding sources of such school

¹ The DoD also operates the Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DoDDS), providing education for the dependents of military personnel stationed overseas.

² The terms “local educational agency” (or “LEA”) and “school district” are used interchangeably. While the former is technically correct, “school district” is the more commonly used term. For example, both U.S. Department of Education publications and publications by the American Educational Research Association typically refer to “school districts.”

districts, including comparisons with other school districts within the state that do not have a large percentage of military-connected students; and (4) the opinions and attitudes of military parents with children attending such school districts regarding the quality of education programs in the schools. (p. 694)

This report presents the findings of the study conducted to address these Congressional concerns. The remainder of this chapter provides a brief overview of the Federal programs examined in this study (i.e., DDESS and Impact Aid). Chapter 2 presents an overview of the methods used to gather and analyze the data. Chapter 3 presents DDESS parents' views on the quality of education in DDESS schools. Chapter 4 presents parents' views on a possible transfer of the education of DDESS students to local public schools. Chapter 5 examines each DDESS site separately, looking at DDESS parents' views on quality and transfer, and reviewing the positions of DDESS, LEA, and installation personnel regarding transfer. The quality of education in LEAs with greater-than-30-percent military-connected enrollments is examined in Chapter 6. A review of funding in these LEAs is presented in Chapter 7. Chapter 8 presents the study's conclusions, including recommendations on transferring the DDESS schools.

The DDESS Schools

History of the DDESS System

Since the days of Army frontier posts, U.S. military installations have established their own schools when no public education was available in the local area. Funding for these schools was often irregular and unsystematic. In 1950, Federal legislation alleviated this problem by consolidating the funding and operation of these installation-run schools under the authority of Section 6 of Public Law No. 81-874. This legislation enabled the Secretary of Education (then the Commissioner of Education) to operate and maintain what became known as Section 6 schools for children residing on Federal property if: (a) state laws prohibited tax revenues of the state or any political subdivision of the state to be expended for the free public education of children residing on Federal property; or (b) education systems within the local communities were judged unable to provide a suitable free public education for these children.³ Public Law No. 81-874 also stated that the Secretary of Education, in consultation with the relevant state education agency, must determine that the local schools could provide a suitable public education for the children residing on Federal property before a Section 6 school could be transferred to an LEA.

In 1981, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (Public Law No. 97-35) transferred responsibility for the Section 6 schools to the Secretary of Defense. For the first year after this transfer, the military services funded the operation of the schools because budget authority had not been provided. While budget authority for operation and maintenance of the Section 6 schools was granted to DoD in 1982, responsibility for this DoD school system was not centralized in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Personnel Support, Families and Education until 1990. In 1994, Public Law No. 103-337 replaced the Section 6 legislation, which was repealed that year, and renamed the school system the Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools.

The Section 6/DDESS system has expanded and contracted over the years. After their initial consolidation in 1950, schools were added to the system as a result of the racial integration of the military. Establishing these Section 6 schools allowed military children to attend integrated schools where local schools remained segregated. Since that time, the trend has been for Section 6 schools to transfer to LEAs,

³ The law did not define "suitable" education, and standards for this term have never been established.

largely as a result of: (a) pressure from the U.S. Department of Education on states and localities to acknowledge responsibility for the education of military dependents; (b) population growth near installations; and (c) the integration of the public schools. Thus, while at one point there were about 100 installations with Section 6 schools, by the early 1970s, most of these schools had been transferred to LEAs. The last transfer of a Section 6 school occurred in 1973. Three other Section 6/DDESS school systems have closed since then as a result of installation closures.⁴ Those DDESS schools that remain tend to be in locations where a transfer is difficult to accomplish.

One prior transfer effort is of particular note. In the early 1950s, the DDESS schools on the Marine Corps base at Quantico, Virginia, were scheduled to be transferred to an LEA. Strong opposition to that transfer by Quantico personnel led to the passage, in 1955, of what is commonly known as the “Quantico Amendment.” This amendment to the original Section 6 legislation required that the transfer of a Section 6 school to an LEA must be approved by the Secretary of Education *and* the Secretary of the relevant military service. Under this amendment, a transfer of the Quantico schools was blocked. The language of this amendment was carried over into the original legislation for the DDESS schools, but was dropped in 1990 when operation of the schools was centralized within DoD. Under today’s legislation, a transfer of a DDESS school must be approved by the Secretary of Defense since these schools are now under DoD and not the Department of Education. The Secretary of Defense thus replaces both the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of the relevant military service.

The Current DDESS System

DDESS schools are centrally administered by DoD’s Education Activity, within the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel Support, Families and Education. The present DDESS system consists of 16 installation-level school systems located in seven states and Puerto Rico. These schools are organized into 13 superintendencies, each consisting of all schools located on one or more installations within a state. Each installation-level DDESS system has an independently elected school board composed of military personnel and/or their spouses. The Fiscal Year 1995 budget for the DDESS system was \$233 million (including the 7 schools in Puerto Rico). For an estimated 33,000 students, this budget yields a per-pupil expenditure of \$6,809. In comparison, the estimated 1995-96 average per-pupil expenditure for public schools in the U.S. was \$5,738.⁵

Because English is not the language of instruction in the Puerto Rican public schools, the DDESS schools in Puerto Rico are not being considered for transfer and are therefore not included in this study. The remaining DDESS schools consist of 59 schools located on 15 military installations in seven states.⁶ While all 15 DDESS sites provide elementary education, only four sites provide a full elementary and secondary education program. Table 1.1 provides an overview of these DDESS sites. The table also lists

⁴ The closed installations are Craig Air Force Base in Texas, England Air Force Base in Louisiana, and Myrtle Beach Air Force Base in South Carolina.

⁵ Amounts in the text are current expenditures, as are all other per-pupil expenditures listed in this report. Using total expenditures, the DDESS PPE was \$7,061 in Fiscal Year 1995, and the national average was an estimated \$6,459. Both sets of DDESS and national figures are based on student enrollment counts, not average daily attendance. National per-pupil expenditures are based on data from the *Digest of Education Statistics* (Snyder, Hoffman, & Geddes, 1996), Table 166, p.166.

⁶ The DoD Education Activity lists 58 schools. This study includes 59 schools because the Quantico Middle School and High School were counted as two schools despite being housed in the same building.

the adjacent LEA(s) that could be involved in any potential transfer of DDESS schools, and the approximate number of DDESS students that would be affected by a transfer.

Table 1.1.
Summary of 15 DDESS Sites

Installation	State	Grades	Number of schools	Enrollment (Sept. 95)	Adjacent LEA
Ft. McClellan	AL	K-6	1	383	Calhoun County, Anniston City, Jacksonville City
Ft. Rucker	AL	PK-6	2	1,102	Dale County, Coffee County, Daleville, Ozark, Enterprise
Maxwell Air Force Base (AFB)	AL	K-6	1	450	Montgomery County
Ft. Benning	GA	K-8	7	3,164	Muscogee County, Chattahoochee County
Ft. Stewart	GA	K-6	2	1,663	Liberty County
Robins AFB	GA	K-6	2	890	Houston County
Ft. Campbell	KY/TN ¹	PK-12	7	4,297	Christian County, KY; Montgomery County, TN
Ft. Knox	KY	PK-12	9	3,677	Hardin County, Meade County
West Point	NY	K-8	1	725	Highland Falls
Ft. Bragg	NC	PK-9	8	4,719	Cumberland County
Camp Lejeune	NC	K-12	8	3,505	Onslow County
Ft. Jackson	SC	PK-6	3	1,034	Richland County Two
Laurel Bay Marine Corps Base (MCB)	SC	PK-6	2	1,285	Beaufort County
Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC)	VA	K-8	1	158	King George County
Quantico MCB	VA	PK-12	5	1,301	Prince William County
Total			59	28,353	

Source: DoD Education Activity

Note: K stands for kindergarten and PK stands for pre-kindergarten.

¹ Fort Campbell is officially known as Fort Campbell, Kentucky, but the installation is located in both Kentucky and Tennessee.

Previous Studies of DDESS Transfer⁷

Periodically, Congress has reviewed the status of the DDESS schools to determine if either individual transfers are appropriate, or Federal responsibility for the entire DDESS system can be shifted to state and local agencies.

In Section 823 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1985 (Public Law No. 98-407), Congress indicated that Federal responsibility for funding and operating the (then) Section 6 system may no longer be necessary. At the same time, Congress instructed the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) to determine the most suitable alternative for funding and operating these schools. GAO was also directed to

⁷ Appendix A includes an annotated bibliography of previous studies examining the issue of transferring the DDESS schools to LEAs.

identify the legal, jurisdictional, and other issues that would have to be resolved to change the funding and operation of these schools.

GAO (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1986) considered three alternatives for funding and operating the Section 6 system:

- *Local Operation:* Responsibility for the Section 6 schools would be transferred to existing LEAs in the neighboring community.
- *Contract Operation* (commonly referred to as a Section 6 arrangement): Neighboring LEAs would operate the Section 6 schools under contract with DoD.
- *Coterminous Operation:* The Section 6 schools would operate as newly created LEAs, with boundaries that are the same as the boundaries of their military installations.

Although there were jurisdictional, legal, and other impediments to each of the three alternatives, GAO recommended that all Section 6 schools be converted to coterminous operation. In its response to the GAO study, DoD suggested that transfer decisions be made on a case-by-case basis, since the Department did not believe one transfer option was the best alternative for all installations. The U.S. Department of Education took yet another position. It recommended transfer of the Section 6 schools to LEAs (“local operation”), pointing out that the coterminous solution would not bring about the desired decrease in Federal funding and that there had been successful transfers to LEAs in the past.

While considering the results of the GAO report, Congress directed the Secretary of Defense (in Section 824 of the Military Construction Act, 1986, Public Law No. 99-167) to submit, by 1 March 1986, a plan for the transfer by 1 July 1990 of all Section 6 schools. This mandate was in response to strong Congressional opposition to the Federal operation of Section 6 schools on both philosophical and budgetary grounds (Bodilly, Wise, & Purnell, 1988). First, elementary and secondary education is traditionally the responsibility of state and local governments. Therefore, some argued, the Federal government should not directly finance or administer these schools. Second, a transfer could produce Federal cost savings. The unwelcome possibility of trading defense needs for education needs during DoD budget negotiations may also have been a factor.

DoD responded to the Congressional directive by providing a general plan for transferring DDESS schools to their LEAs. The transfer plan included four phases: initial planning, detailed issue development, option preparation, and submission of legislative proposals to Congress. This approach recognized the need to negotiate with states and LEAs in order to implement an efficient transfer of DDESS schools.

To develop the transfer issues and options, DoD asked the RAND Corporation to collect and analyze data from each of the 17 U.S.-based Section 6 systems operating at that time (1980s). Each of the 17 in-depth case studies addressed the extent to which each site was ready for transfer and the type of transfer option that was most appropriate for each site. RAND evaluated five transfer options: the three GAO alternatives, and the two additional options of “no transfer” and “assisted transfer.” The assisted transfer option would transfer the Section 6 schools to an LEA, but Federal funds in addition to Impact Aid (discussed below) would be made available to the LEA. The additional funds were to ensure that the LEA could provide a suitable education to the former Section 6 students. Based on their case studies, the RAND Corporation recommended the consideration of a transfer of some Section 6 schools. Their report also concluded, however, that no Section 6 school could be transferred without substantial initial and, in some

instances, continuing cost to the Federal government (Bodilly et al., 1988; Purnell, Wise, Bodilly, & Hudson, 1991).

Based on findings from RAND's studies and its own investigations, DoD concluded that transferring the DDESS system was not feasible. The DoD conclusion was based on four findings. First, none of the parties to a possible transfer had demonstrated significant support for such action. Second, the local communities were strongly opposed to absorbing the additional students. Third, military parents were concerned that a transfer would compromise the quality of their children's education. Fourth, substantial economic, logistical, and personnel problems were associated with a transfer at each site. Although Congress gave no formal reply to DoD's conclusion, the Senate Armed Services Committee and members of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the House Armed Services Committee concurred that transfer of the DDESS schools was not advisable (see Purnell et al., 1991, pp. 2-3).

The issue remained at that stage until the Conference Report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 requested a new study of the transfer issue. This newly requested study differs from the RAND study in important ways. For example, the conferees' directive, and thus the study, focus on parents' views regarding the quality of education provided by the DDESS schools. While the current study also includes site visits to installations with DDESS systems, these site visits are less extensive than the in-depth case studies conducted by RAND. The current site visits focus largely on the key logistical and financial impediments to a transfer that were identified in the earlier RAND study. The methodology of the current DDESS study is explained further in Chapter 2.

Impact Aid

Rationale for Impact Aid Funds

Federal installations can place a financial burden on state and local governments. Families living on Federal property do not contribute to the property tax base, nor does the Federal government pay taxes for its property. Since military members and their spouses are often legal residents of states other than the one in which they reside, state governments may also be denied income taxes from these individuals. In addition, local communities around an installation often have added costs resulting from the presence of the installation (e.g., roadway construction). This financial burden is particularly noticeable in smaller communities that furnish services to large installations. The financial burden on state and local governments can be offset by the jobs and demand for goods and services created by an installation's presence. In this way, a Federal installation indirectly contributes to the tax revenues of state and local governments and adds to local growth.

The benefits of the Federal presence, however, may not flow to LEAs since LEAs are largely funded from real property taxes (both residential and commercial) and sales taxes. For example, the local government has no taxing authority over Federal property on which military students may reside, or over on-installation businesses such as commissaries, exchanges, and filling stations that provide services to military service members and their families. Through the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act⁸ the local

⁸ The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. Sec. 50-648; 560-591; AFP 100-3, Chapter 18), was passed by Congress to provide protection for individuals entering active duty in the military services. The intent of the Act is to postpone or suspend certain civil obligations to enable service members to devote full attention to duty. In the case of taxes, the Act specifies that the service members' state of legal domicile may tax military income and personal property; however, the service members' legal domicile is not changed solely

government also has no taxing authority over most military service members' personal property. Thus, although state funding allocations to LEAs typically include funds for military-connected students, the LEA often has no source of revenue for the local contribution to educate these children. As a result, to the extent that students' parents live or work on untaxed Federal property, LEAs may have insufficient revenues to cover the costs of educating these students. Insufficient revenue is most clearly evident when LEAs serve large numbers of students whose families both live and work on Federal property. In these cases, LEAs are denied both the residential and commercial tax base that would normally be used to support their education programs.

Impact Aid funds are designed to compensate LEAs for this loss of tax revenue. The program currently compensates LEAs for the education of children of those who live or work on military installations or other Federal facilities, as well as those who live on Indian lands, in Federal low-rent housing, or on other Federal property.

History of Impact Aid

The Federal government has long recognized an obligation to bear part of the costs of educating Federally connected students. Prior to World War II, Federal agencies worked with the Congress on a case-by-case basis to arrange funding for education services in each area where an LEA was affected by the Federal presence. Special arrangements with LEAs varied considerably. In some areas, small contributions were made to cover unfunded portions of the school budget. In other locations, payments equaled 100 percent of the costs of educating Federally-connected students.

During World War II, Congress funded "war" housing and schools for the large numbers of military and civilian families who moved to military installations and military-operated production sites. Following the war, legislation continued funding for those schools that had received financial assistance during the war. In 1950, Congress recognized that children residing on untaxed Federal property continued to present a problem for LEAs. Therefore, it consolidated all funding for Federally affected LEAs within Public Law No. 81-874 (20 U.S.C. § 236 *et seq.*), commonly known as the Impact Aid law.

Public Law No. 81-874 placed all Federal programs addressing the impact of Federal ownership of property on LEAs under one agency, the U.S. Department of Education. The Impact Aid program was designed to compensate local educational agencies for (a) loss of property tax revenue due to the nontaxable status of Federally acquired property within their jurisdictions and (b) the cost of educating Federally-connected children in local public schools. The obligation for providing public education to Federally-connected students remained a state and local responsibility.

The Impact Aid program was reauthorized as Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law No. 103-382). The new law targets payments to Federally impacted school districts with the greatest need. These payments are derived through a funding formula that assigns weights to students based on factors such as whether the students have disabilities or reside on certain Indian lands, or, for LEAs where the proportion of Federally-connected students is at least 50 percent, the LEA meets the state (or comparable LEA) per-pupil expenditure. Section 8006 of the law also provides funding for special situations where the establishment, reactivation, or realignment of Federal activities in an area increases school attendance so suddenly and substantially that the affected LEA cannot adjust financially. LEAs are reimbursed for two categories of children of DoD employees: (a) children who live

by a change in duty station. The application of the Act in this case means that the locality in which the service member currently resides often will not be the service member's legal residence; thus, the service member will not be subject to the taxes which often comprise the local revenues to support the LEA.

on Federal property whose parents work on Federal property or are on active-duty in the uniformed services; and (b) children who live in the community whose parents are on active duty in the uniformed services. For easy reference (and to be consistent with the original legislative language), this report will refer to those children who live on Federal property as Category A students, and those who live in the community as Category B students.

Because they place a greater financial burden on LEAs, Category A students generate higher Impact Aid payments than do Category B students. This difference has grown in recent years, as Impact Aid payments for Category B students have declined dramatically. For example, prior to 1982, the payment rate for Category B students was 50 percent of the Category A student entitlement. This rate dropped to 17 percent by 1987. Today, the payment rate for Category B students is 10 percent of the Category A student entitlement.

Impact Aid Funding Levels

From its enactment (in 1950) through 1981, the Impact Aid program was funded at nearly the maximum authorized. Program funding dropped significantly in Fiscal Year 1982. Although there was some recovery from Fiscal Years 1982 to 1985, appropriations have not kept pace with inflation since then. As a result, there has been a 10-year decline in Impact Aid funding after adjusting for inflation (see Figure 1.1). Currently, the Impact Aid program is funded at about 53 percent of entitlement.⁹ Since LEAs with the highest concentrations of Federally-connected students usually have the fewest alternatives for making up this funding shortfall, they have felt the greatest effects of declines in Impact Aid funds.¹⁰

DoD Supplemental Funds

At some military installations, recent declines in Impact Aid funds have raised tensions between the local community and the installation. Reports to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management Policy¹¹ suggest that some non-military members of the communities adjacent to installations are feeling increasingly burdened with the expense of educating the children of installation personnel. To alleviate this situation, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Title III, Part A, Section 306) required that the Secretary of Defense submit to Congressional committees criteria and procedures to be used to select LEAs for supplemental financial assistance (P.L. 101-189). To target these supplemental funds to LEAs most in need of assistance, two major criteria were established for eligibility. The first category of eligible LEAs are those for which a minimum proportion of the LEA enrollment consists of DoD-connected students (defined as dependent children of military service members or of civilian DoD employees). A second group of LEAs are eligible if they have experienced a sharp increase in their DoD-connected enrollments (typically as a result of installation realignments).


These DoD supplemental funds were available for four of the six years between their initial authorization in 1990 and 1995. Over that time, the targeting of funds broadened to include more LEAs. Thus, while criteria for the 1990 supplement required that at least 35 percent of an LEA's enrollments be DoD-connected, the 1996 criterion required only that at least 20 percent be DoD-connected.

⁹ Cathy Schagh, Director, U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid Office, personal communication, April 2, 1997.

¹⁰ Chapter 7 provides a more detailed analysis of Impact Aid funding.

¹¹ This Office (or its designee) serves as the liaison between DoD and the Department of Education on Impact Aid issues.

Figure 1.1.
Total Federal Impact Aid Funding, by Year
(1981-1994 in constant 1994 dollars, 1995-1996 in annual dollars)



Source: Military Impacted Schools Association, June, 1995.

Current Funding Allocations

When this study began in Fiscal Year 1995, the Impact Aid program provided funding to approximately 1,600 LEAs, of which about 600 received funding because they were educating the children of personnel assigned to military installations.¹² These funds compensated LEAs for the education of about 1.7 million Federally-connected students, about 548,200 of whom were children of Department of Defense employees. Of these 548,200 students, approximately 203,700 resided on Federal property (Category A students) and 344,500 resided off Federal property (Category B students). In 1995, the 600 or so LEAs serving these DoD-connected students received \$350 million in Impact Aid. There were no DoD supplemental funds in Fiscal Year 1995.

As mentioned above, recent declines in Impact Aid funding have raised concerns in two areas: (a) about the relations between military installations and their neighboring LEAs and (b) about the ability of these LEAs to fund their schools at an appropriate level. These concerns are heightened by current Congressional interest in transferring the education of DDESS students to LEAs. This transfer would increase significantly military-connected enrollments—and reliance on Impact Aid—in the LEAs that would absorb these students. To the extent that Impact Aid is viewed as an unreliable or insufficient funding source, LEAs are unlikely to be interested in assuming the responsibility for educating additional military-connected students.

In sum, this study consists of two mostly independent “sub-studies.” One sub-study addresses the DDESS schools and their possible transfer to LEAs. The second examines LEAs that rely heavily on Impact Aid funds. These two sub-studies are linked by the implications of a possible transfer of the DDESS schools to LEAs.

¹² This is from a total of about 15,000 LEAs in the country.

Chapter 2: Study Methodology

This study consists of two independent sets of data collections responding to the Congressional mandate listed in Chapter 1. The first part of the study focuses on the DDESS schools, and the second part examines LEAs with large portions of military-connected students (in this report, sometimes called Impact Aid LEAs). Each set of data collections utilized multiple methods, combining statistical estimation of quantitative survey data with qualitative interview data.

This chapter describes three methodological issues. The first section of the chapter describes the DDESS data-gathering procedures and the people who supplied information on the DDESS schools. The second section parallels the first section, except it describes LEA procedures and respondents. The final section in this chapter provides an overview of the statistical procedures that were used to analyze the DDESS and LEA survey data.

Data Collection for DDESS Schools

Table 2.1 lists the five DDESS target populations and the type of instrument that was used to collect data from each. The table also summarizes the approach that was used to gather the data and the issues that were addressed with each data-gathering effort. The items for the five data-collection instruments were identified by reviews of the authorizing legislation, past studies of DDESS schools (see annotated bibliography in Appendix A), extant surveys addressing school or education quality, and discussions with DDESS parents and school officials during three preliminary DDESS site visits.

Table 2.1.
DDESS Data Collections

Population	Data-Collection Instrument	Data-Collection Approach	Issues Addressed
Parents of DDESS students	Self-administered, mailed survey	Sample of parents from each of the 59 DDESS schools	Quality of educational programs and transfer of DDESS to LEA
Superintendents of the 15 DDESS systems	In-person interview	Site-visit interview with all 15 superintendents	Transfer of DDESS to LEA
Commanders at the 15 installations with DDESS schools	In-person interview	Site-visit interview with all 15 commanders (or a command representative)	Transfer of DDESS to LEA
Superintendents from the 24 LEAs adjacent to a DDESS system	In-person interview	Site-visit interview with all 24 superintendents	Transfer of DDESS to LEA and responsibility to educate DDESS students
State education officials from each of the 8 states ¹ that could receive DDESS students	Telephone interview	Interview with a representative from each of the 8 states	Transfer of DDESS to LEA and responsibility to educate DDESS students

¹ Since the DDESS students on Fort Campbell could be transferred to LEAs in either Tennessee or Kentucky, both states were included in this data collection.

Assignment of items to data collection instruments attempted to identify the best source of the required data while minimizing the response burden on each respondent group.

The remainder of this section is organized into three parts, corresponding to the three approaches used to gather data on DDESS schools: the parent survey, site visits (i.e., in-person interviews), and the telephone interview of state education officials.

DDESS Parent Survey

The *Survey of Parents' Opinions on Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools* (hereafter called *DDESS Survey*) was used to collect information from DDESS parents. The *DDESS Survey* (shown in Appendix B) focused on parents' opinions of the quality of education at their child's DDESS school and their views on the possible transfer of the DDESS school to the local schools. Demographic background questions were also included.

Fall 1995 lists of parents from the 59 DDESS schools provided a sampling frame of 21,701 DDESS parents. The *DDESS Survey* was administered to a non-proportional stratified random sample of 12,256 of these parents. The sample was stratified by the 59 DDESS schools. Parents who had children in two or more DDESS schools (e.g., an elementary school and a middle school) could be selected for the sample more than once.

Survey administration began in December 1995, with the mailing of notification letters to all 12,256 sample members. The notification letters informed sample members that they would be receiving a survey and served as a check on sample member eligibility (i.e., whether the parent had a child in a DDESS school in school year 1995-96). One month later, eligible sample members were mailed a copy of the *DDESS Survey* with a cover letter. Two weeks after the survey mailing, a reminder/thank-you letter was sent to all eligible sample members. After another two weeks, all eligible sample members who had not returned a survey were mailed a second copy of the *DDESS Survey* with a new cover letter. All letters were sent on DoD DDESS stationery, were signed by the DDESS director, and included a personalized salutation. The survey field closed in March 1996.

The survey administration resulted in 7,947 returns from eligible sample members. The response rate for eligible sample members was 65 percent, and the completion rate for eligible, located sample members was 66 percent. Installation-level response rates ranged from 58 percent to 85 percent. More information on the survey sample, survey instrument, and survey administration procedure is available in the *Technical Manual for the Survey of Parents' Opinions on the Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools* (Hudson & Helmick, in preparation).

Site Visits

Between August 1995 and January 1996, each of the 15 U.S.-based installations that has a DDESS system was visited. At each site, interviews were conducted separately with the installation commander or a representative (e.g., the garrison commander), the DDESS superintendent, and the superintendent of each adjacent LEA that might receive DDESS students if a transfer were to occur. These interviews asked respondents their positions regarding the transfer of the DDESS schools to the LEA, including the factors that would impede or facilitate a transfer. The LEA superintendent was also queried regarding the LEA's position on the responsibility to provide a public education to children living on military installations. A copy of the questions from the three interview protocols is included in Appendix C.

At most sites, the DDESS superintendent also arranged for group interviews with other stakeholders in a transfer decision. These groups typically included some combination of DDESS school board members, teachers, administrators, and parents. Because these groups were not originally part of the study, formal interview protocols were not used with them. Instead, informal discussions focused on each group's positions on and concerns about a potential transfer.

A team of two researchers conducted all site visits, except at Maxwell Air Force base and Fort McClellan. At these two installations, only one member of the team conducted the site visit. Prior to the site visits, respondents (i.e., DDESS superintendents, LEA superintendents, and military installation commanders) were mailed letters that explained the purpose of the study and listed findings on their particular site from the previous RAND study. The advance mailing also included a copy of the interview protocol. Most site visits were accomplished in one or two days, depending on the number of adjacent LEAs to be contacted. Most interviews were conducted in the offices of the respondent. Thus, a typical site visit included visits to both the installation and the local community (or communities). On a few occasions, all parties assembled at one location (usually on the military installation).

Telephone Interviews with State Education Officials

During July 1996, telephone interviews were conducted with state-level education officials in each of the eight states that have military installations with DDESS systems. Advance letters were sent to each state's chief education officer (e.g., superintendent, commissioner) outlining the purpose of the study and providing a copy of the interview protocol. The advance letter included a toll-free telephone number that the state education officer could use to provide the name of a point of contact for the interview and/or to schedule a convenient time for the interview.

Telephone interviews typically were conducted with either the state's chief education officer or a designated representative (e.g., finance director, general counsel). Interviews collected data on each state's position regarding the possible transfer of the within-state DDESS school system(s) to LEAs and the state's responsibility for providing a public education to children living on military installations. Additional issues included the conditions under which a transfer could occur (e.g., ownership of or access to DDESS facilities, representation of military parents on LEA school boards) and the identification of transfer problems and potential solutions. Appendix C contains a copy of the interview protocol.

Data Collection for Impact Aid LEAs

The first step for this portion of the data collection was to identify LEAs in which over 30 percent of enrolled students were military-connected. The Impact Aid legislation authorizes payments on behalf of children whose parents are either on active duty in the Uniformed Services (Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) or are civilian employees at DoD installations. For its reports, the U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid Office implements this definition as children who live on Federal DoD property and/or who have a parent employed on DoD property; employers include both civilian DoD employers and the Uniformed Services. Using this Impact Aid definition and enrollment data from Impact Aid applications (for school year 1994-95), 97 LEAs were identified as meeting the Congressional criterion of having an enrollment that is over 30 percent military-connected. Follow-up telephone calls to confirm LEA enrollments eliminated four of these

LEAs (due to base closures and/or cessation of Impact Aid funding).¹³ Thus, the final target LEAs consisted of 93 LEAs, located in 34 states. Table F.1 in Appendix F provides a listing of the 93 target LEAs.

Table 2.2 specifies the groups that were asked to supply information on the 93 target LEAs. The issues addressed in each data-gathering instrument were identified by reviews of the authorizing legislation and of extant surveys addressing education funding or school quality. Assignment of items to data collection instruments attempted to identify the best source of the required data while minimizing the response burden on each respondent group.

Table 2.2.
Data Collections for Target Impact Aid LEAs

Population	Data-Collection Instrument	Data-Collection Approach	Issues Addressed
Military parents of students in the 93 target LEAs	Self-administered, mailed survey	Sample of parents from each of the 93 target LEAs	Quality of educational programs
Superintendents of the 93 target LEAs	Telephone interview	Interview with all 93 superintendents	Funding levels and sources, and responsibility to educate military-connected students
State education officials from each of the 34 states having one or more target LEAs	Telephone interview	Interview with a representative from each of the 34 states	Funding levels and sources, and responsibility to educate military-connected students
93 target LEAs	U.S. Department of Education's Common Core of Data	Records extraction	Funding levels and sources

LEA Parent Survey

The *Department of Defense Survey of Parents' Opinions on Local Schools* (hereafter called *LEA Survey*) was used to collect data on military parents' opinions of the quality of education at the LEA school their child attended. Many of the items are the same as those found in the *DDESS Survey* since education quality was a major focus for both the DDESS and LEA portions of the study. (See Appendix D for a copy of the *LEA Survey*.¹⁴)

¹³ It is important to note that the definition of military-connected used in this study includes DoD civilians. The follow-up telephone calls revealed that 43 LEAs had less than 30 percent of their enrollments consisting of *exclusively* military-connected students (i.e., not including children of DoD civilians). These 43 LEAs were kept in the study, however, because they met the original Impact Aid definition.

¹⁴ The last page of the *LEA Survey* lists 95 (rather than 93) target LEAs. That list was developed before follow-up telephone calls to confirm LEA enrollments were completed. As a result, two LEAs that were later eliminated from the target LEAs were listed on the survey form. Parents from these two LEAs were not included in the survey sample.

Neither DoD nor the Impact Aid Office had a list of the names and addresses of military members whose children were enrolled in the 93 target LEAs. As a result, information from DoD's Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS) was used to construct the sampling frame for this survey population. The DEERS file lists a primary military sponsor for each family eligible for military health-care benefits and includes the home addresses of all sponsors and the ages of all family members. From this list, sponsors were matched to LEAs by their home postal zip code.¹⁵ Parents of school children were identified by their children's ages. The sampling frame thus listed all 177,143 active-duty military service members who had, as of September 1995, at least one family member aged 5-17 and who lived in a zip code covered by one of the 93 target LEAs. A non-proportional stratified random sample of 33,004 parents was selected from this sampling frame to receive a survey. The sample was stratified by state and by LEA.

Survey administration began in April 1996 with the mailing of notification letters to all sample members. The notification letters informed sample members that they would be receiving a survey and served as a check on sample member eligibility (i.e., whether the member had a child in a target LEA in school year 1995-96). One month later, eligible sample members were mailed a copy of the *LEA Survey* with a cover letter. Two weeks later, a reminder/thank-you letter was sent to all eligible sample members. After another two weeks, all eligible sample members who had not returned a survey were mailed a second copy of the *LEA Survey* with a new cover letter. All letters were sent on letterhead from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Management Policy and signed by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Personnel Support, Families and Education. The survey field closed in October 1996.

The survey administration resulted in 14,170 returns from eligible sample members. The survey response rate for eligible sample members was 52 percent, and the completion rate for eligible, located sample members was 54 percent. Individual LEA response rates ranged from 28 percent to 69 percent. More information on the survey sample, survey instrument and survey administration procedures is available in the *Technical Manual for the Survey of Parents' Opinions on Local Schools* (Hudson & Helmick, in preparation).

Telephone Interviews with LEA Officials

Telephone interviews with local education officials in the 93 Impact Aid LEAs were conducted in June through August 1996. Advance letters were sent to each of the 93 LEA superintendents outlining the purpose of the study and providing a copy of the interview protocol. The advance letter included a toll-free telephone number that the LEA superintendent could use to provide the name of a point of contact for the interview and/or to schedule a convenient time for the interview.

In most LEAs, interviews were conducted with the LEA superintendent or assistant superintendent. In other LEAs, the interview was conducted with the superintendent's designated representative (e.g., business manager, chief budget officer). These interviews collected data on the LEA's position regarding its responsibility to provide a public education to military-connected children, LEA funding sources, the use of education funds from various sources, problems associated with providing education services to military-connected children, and the adequacy and reliability of Impact Aid and DoD supplemental funds. Appendix E contains a copy of the interview protocol.

¹⁵ Each of the 93 LEAs was called and asked for a listing of the zip codes from which it draws students. This listing was matched to sponsor's home zip codes in the DEERS file.

Of the 93 LEAs contacted for the interview, 91 agreed to participate. Two participating LEAs could not complete the interview (due to time constraints). Thus, complete interview data were obtained for 89 of the 93 Impact Aid LEAs.

Telephone Interviews with State Education Officials

Telephone interviews with state education officials in the 34 states that have one or more target LEAs were conducted in June through August 1996. Advance letters were sent to each of the 34 state chief education officers (e.g., superintendent, commissioner) outlining the purpose of the study and providing a copy of the interview protocol. The advance letter included a toll-free telephone number that the state education officer could use to provide the name of a point of contact for the interview and/or to schedule a convenient time for the interview.

The telephone interviews were conducted with either the commissioner/superintendent or a designated representative (e.g., finance director, general counsel). Interviews collected data on levels of financial support provided by DoD and other Federal agencies, responsibility for providing a public education to military-connected students, and state-level financial assistance to LEAs. All 34 states participated in the interviews. Appendix E contains a copy of the interview protocol.

Analytic Approach for Parent Surveys

Weighting Procedures

Responses from the *DDESS Survey* and the *LEA Survey* were weighted to ensure that the responses of sampled parents represent the entire population of eligible parents. The weights reflect (a) the probability of selection for that parent, (b) a nonresponse adjustment factor to minimize bias arising from different response rates among demographic subgroups of the parent population, and (c) a poststratification factor. As a result of these adjustments, the final parent weights for each survey sum to the total number of parents on the sampling frame. Because both parent surveys utilized a complex sample design (i.e., non-proportional stratified random sampling with unequal probabilities of selection for population subgroups), special statistical software (WESVAR[®]) was used to compute unbiased variance estimates for all survey statistics. The two survey *Technical Manuals* (cited above) provide further information on survey sample design and the calculation of variance estimates.

In interpreting results from the parent surveys, it should be noted that all sample surveys are subject to sampling error. This sampling error is normally expressed as a standard error. The standard error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among estimates from all the possible samples that could be drawn. Estimates in this report are expressed as percentages and are reported with a 95% confidence interval half-width that is based on the standard error of the estimate. By adding and subtracting the 95% confidence interval half-width from the reported percentage estimate, one obtains the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. To test whether two percentage estimates are statistically different, one compares the range of the 95% confidence interval for each estimate. When these intervals overlap, it is safe to assume that the difference between the estimates is not statistically significant (at the 95% confidence level). In comparisons where the intervals do not overlap, it can be assumed that the differences are statistically significant. In the tables in this report, the confidence interval half-widths are labeled "CI" and are usually listed to the right of the estimate to which they apply.

Readers should be cautioned that comparisons of estimates based on very large samples (such as the total sample of all DDESS or all LEA parents) can yield very small differences that are statistically significant. These small differences may not be of practical relevance to school programming and decision making. It is up to the policy maker to decide whether a “statistically” significant result is also “practically” significant.

Parent Subgroups

For some survey data, parents of different types were compared. On both parent surveys, these comparison groups included parents in different paygrade (rank) groups and parents with children attending schools at different grade levels. On the *DDESS Survey*, parents with and without children who have attended public schools also were compared. A short rationale for and description of each of these analysis groups follows.

Paygrade groups. In military research, findings are often examined separately for service members in different military paygrade or rank groups. In the present study, a parent’s paygrade is important not only because of its relevance to the overall structure of the military (including differences in policies, pay levels, and living conditions), but also because of its relationship to a parent’s education level. As a group, individuals at higher paygrades tend to have completed more years of education than individuals from lower paygrades. For example, Table 2.3 shows the relationship between paygrade group and years of education among military parents responding to the *DDESS Survey* and to the *LEA Survey*. As this table shows, most commissioned officers have at least 16 years of education. Senior enlisted and warrant officers tend to be high school graduates with some college education, while junior enlisted personnel are predominantly high school graduates with no postsecondary education. (These paygrade groups are defined below.)

Table 2.3.
Level of Education of DDESS and Impact Aid LEA Parents, by Paygrade Group

Paygrade Group	Percent with Given Years of Education					
	12	13	14	15	16	More than 16
DDESS Parents						
Commissioned Officers	16	4	3	<1	40	38
Senior Enlisted/Warrant Officers	43	20	23	3	9	2
Junior Enlisted	69	13	11	2	4	1
Impact Aid LEA Parents						
Commissioned Officers	2	2	1	<1	46	49
Senior Enlisted/Warrant Officers	41	17	29	4	8	1
Junior Enlisted	68	14	13	2	3	<1

Source: *DDESS Survey*, Question 18 (paygrade); *LEA Survey*, Question 15 (paygrade); September 1995 DEERS file (years of education)

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

While it was possible to examine the survey findings directly for the influence of education, paygrade was chosen because of its more direct relevance to the population being studied—military personnel—and because of the greater observability of this measure. The present analyses assumed that

the education level of parents would be related to the education expectations that parents have for their children and their children's schools—that is, more educated/higher ranked parents are expected to have higher education expectations than do their less educated/lower ranked counterparts.

Parents' self-reported paygrade on the parent surveys was used to construct three categories of paygrade. First, all officers in paygrades O1 and above were categorized as "commissioned officers." Seventeen percent of the DDESS parents, and 14 percent of the LEA parents, fell into this category. A second a category of "senior enlisted and warrant officers" was constructed from all enlisted personnel in paygrades E7 through E9 and all warrant officers (paygrades W1-W5). Twenty-six percent of the DDESS parents and 30 percent of the LEA parents fell into this group. Finally, all enlisted personnel in paygrades E1 through E6 were categorized as "junior enlisted." Fifty-seven percent of the DDESS parents and 56 percent of the LEA parents were junior enlisted personnel.¹⁶

Level of school. Parents' views on their child's education also might vary according to the child's grade in school. For example, parents may be more likely to be concerned with having younger children (rather than older children) attend school closer to home. Concerns with the environment within the school, on the other hand, may be greater for parents of older students than for parents of younger students. Gang activity, drug use, and other such problems are more widespread among children in middle schools and high schools.

To assess these grade-level differences, three school-level categories were created based on the child's grade level as reported in the parent survey: elementary school (pre-kindergarten through grade six), middle school (grades 7 and 8), and high school (grades 9 through 12). As would be expected given the composition of the DDESS schools, elementary school parents represented the largest portion of DDESS parents at 78 percent; middle and high school parents each represented 11 percent of all DDESS parents. Among LEA parents, 66 percent were elementary school parents, 14 percent were middle school parents, and 20 percent were high school parents.

Parents' public school experience. DDESS parents learn about the public schools through both hearsay and, for parents with children who have attended public schools, experience with their own children. The latter group is likely to have a better basis than the former for judging the (relative) quality of their child's current education program. "Experienced" parents are also likely to have a more realistic view of the implications of a transfer of the DDESS schools to the public school system. To see if first-hand public school experience led to different views on these issues, we examined opinions on DDESS quality and transfer for DDESS parents with and without such experience. Using self-reported survey data, DDESS parents were divided into two groups: (a) those reporting that they currently have, or have had, a child in a public school; and (b) those reporting that they do not have a child who has attended a public school. Most parents of DDESS students, 72 percent, reported some public school experience; only 28 percent had no such experience.

¹⁶ In comparison, as of March 1996, 15 percent of the total active-duty military were commissioned officers, 11 percent were senior enlisted and warrant officers, and 74 percent were junior enlisted. (Data from the March 1996 DEERS file.)

Chapter 3: Parents' Views on DDESS School Quality

As discussed in Chapter 1, Congress requested that DoD survey parents' opinions on both the quality of education provided to their children by DDESS schools and the possible transfer of DDESS schools to local school districts. This chapter and the next two address these issues, using findings from the *DDESS Survey*. This chapter examines parents' views on education quality as it applies to the DDESS system as a whole, and the next chapter covers the opinions of DDESS parents regarding the potential transfer of DDESS schools to local school districts. Since a transfer of DDESS schools would have to be negotiated at each DDESS site, Chapter 5 explores these issues for each installation.

Although this chapter focuses on findings from the *DDESS Survey*, some site-visit results and *LEA Survey* findings are included to establish a context for understanding the *DDESS Survey* findings more fully. (The major portions of the site-visit and *LEA Survey* results are presented in Chapters 5 and 6, respectively.) Findings presented in this chapter are organized into three main sections: general opinions regarding DDESS schools, evaluation of the quality of DDESS educational programs, and ratings of DDESS school quality relative to quality in other schools. The chapter ends with a summary of findings.

Opinions about DDESS Schools

DDESS parents were asked several questions about general aspects of DDESS schools. These questions can be divided into three categories: how much parents agreed with general characterizations of their child's school as well-run and effective, how much input parents thought they had with regard to school decision-making, and how important a DDESS school was to parents' decision to live on the installation.

General Characterizations of the School

Parents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with 10 statements that characterize DDESS schools as well-run, high-quality schools.¹⁷ Some statements focused on particular aspects of school quality (e.g., instructional quality), while others reflected aspects related to overall school quality (e.g., the reputation of the school). Table 3.1 presents the statements and parents' responses. The statements are ordered from those with the highest to lowest percentage of agreement.

In general, parents expressed very positive opinions about these 10 aspects of the DDESS education system. Although it is not shown in the table, approximately 51 percent of parents agreed with all 10 statements. Agreement with individual statements ranged from 74 percent to 93 percent. DDESS parents who did not agree with a particular statement seemed more inclined to be neutral than to disagree with the statement; no more than six percent of parents disagreed with any statement.

Four of the statements were endorsed by at least 9 of every 10 DDESS parents. Parents agreed most often with the statements, "This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning" and "This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning." The two statements

¹⁷ This analysis excludes an eleventh item that asked parents whether they agreed with the statement, "This school is *not* underfunded." Responses to this item were much less positive than were responses to the other 10 items. While this finding could reflect a less positive view of school funding, it seems more likely that the wording of the item confused some respondents. Based on the latter assumption, this item was omitted from all analyses.

Table 3.1.

DDESS Parents' Level of Agreement with Positive Characterizations of the DDESS School

Characterization of the DDESS School	Percent Agreeing/Disagreeing with Each Statement ¹					
	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning.	93	±0.6	4	±0.4	3	±0.4
This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning.	93	±0.6	4	±0.4	3	±0.4
This school is providing my child with a good education.	90	±0.6	6	±0.4	4	±0.4
The quality of instruction at this school is good.	90	±0.6	7	±0.6	3	±0.4
This school is well-equipped; students have the necessary books and materials, access to computers, science labs, etc.	89	±0.6	6	±0.4	5	±0.4
Students at this school are treated fairly, regardless of their race, sex, or social class.	86	±0.8	10	±0.8	4	±0.4
This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students.	85	±0.8	11	±0.8	4	±0.4
This school has a good reputation.	84	±1.0	13	±1.0	3	±0.4
This school's academic program is challenging and rigorous.	83	±0.8	11	±0.8	6	±0.4
This school provides additional help to students who have trouble learning.	74	±1.0	21	±1.0	5	±0.6

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 1

¹The agree category includes parents who marked *agree* or *strongly agree*, and the disagree category includes parents who marked *disagree* or *strongly disagree*.

most directly related to overall school quality—"This school is providing my child with a good education" and "The quality of instruction at this school is good"—had the next highest agreement level (90%). Only one statement, "This school provides additional help to students who have trouble learning," was endorsed by less than three quarters of the parents.

These DDESS parents' endorsement rates were, with one exception, 15 to 20 percentage points higher than those given by military parents who rated their child's local school on the *LEA Survey* (see Chapter 6). The one exception was for the statement, "This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students." On this statement, DDESS parents' agreement level was 33 percentage points higher than LEA parents' level (85% versus 52%, respectively). This large difference supports the views of site-visit participants. The site-visit participants maintained that DDESS schools are much better than public schools at addressing the special needs of the children of military personnel.

Parents' Voice in School Decisions

Parent involvement in their children's education is frequently viewed as a general indication of education quality (e.g., National Center for Education Statistics, 1996; National Education Goals Panel, 1995). In addition, during the site visits, DDESS parents and personnel frequently cited parent involvement as an important feature of the DDESS schools that they feared losing in a possible transfer. Table 3.1 shows that 93 percent of DDESS parents agreed that DDESS schools encourage parents to become involved with their child's learning. This strong endorsement of DDESS parent involvement was

supported by the findings from another survey question that asked parents the extent to which they felt they had an adequate voice in decision-making at their child's school.¹⁸

Eighty-eight percent of DDESS parents believed that they have at least a moderate voice in education decision-making at their child's school. Almost half (47%; $CI=\pm 1.0$) believed that their voice in such decisions was large or very large, and 31 percent ($CI=\pm 1.0$) believed they had a moderate voice in these decisions. Only 22 percent ($CI=\pm 0.8$) believed they had no more than a small voice in school decision-making. In comparison, parents on the *LEA Survey* revealed much lower levels of involvement (see Chapter 6). Only 55 percent of LEA parents stated that they had at least a moderate voice in school decision-making, and only 20 percent felt their voice in these decisions was large or very large. This lower level of representation reported by LEA parents validates another fear expressed by DDESS parents during the site visits. DDESS parents and school board members at many sites were concerned that a transfer to local school districts would reduce military parents' influence over their children's education.

Availability of DDESS Schools as a Reason for Living on Military Installation

One indication of the value placed on DDESS schools is the extent to which the availability of these schools affects a parent's decision to live on an installation. Except for West Point, all 15 DDESS sites provide limited opportunities for assigned personnel and family members to live in on-base housing.¹⁹ (West Point provides government housing for all assigned personnel and their families and requires that they live on the installation.) The desirability of living in on-base housing is determined by many factors. For example, the price of homes and rental units in the local community may be higher at some installations than at others, or a family (e.g., with a disabled child) may need to be located close to an installation's medical and family services. Since only children residing on an installation are allowed to attend the DDESS schools, the desire to have one's children attend these schools could be an additional factor affecting families' housing decisions at the installations with DDESS systems.

To examine the role of DDESS schools in parents' housing decisions, DDESS parents were asked to indicate the extent to which each of six factors (including "availability of Department of Defense schools") affected their decision to live on the military installation. Table 3.2 lists these factors (and their ratings) for the 14 DDESS sites where installation housing is an option. The factors are listed in order from those rated most important to least important (based on the percentage of parents who said the factor influenced their decision to a *very large extent* or a *large extent*).

The availability of DoD schools, along with public safety and the convenience of living on base, ranked among the top factors affecting parents' decisions to live on an installation. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the parents indicated that their decision to live on the installation was affected to at least a *large extent* by the availability of DDESS schools. This finding suggests that for most (on-base) parents, DDESS schools are viewed as a benefit that contributes to their desire to live on an installation (as was also suggested in the site visits).

¹⁸ Question 4 on the *DDESS Survey*.

¹⁹ In general, on-base family housing at DDESS sites (other than West Point) is sufficient to house only about one-third of an installation's family members. The average waiting time for on-base housing is 6 to 18 months.

Table 3.2.

Factors Affecting DDESS Parent Decisions to Live on the Military Installation¹

Factor Influencing Decision	Percent Reporting Each Extent of Influence for a Factor					
	Very large or large extent		Moderate extent		Small extent or not at all	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Convenience of living on base	75	±0.8	14	±0.6	10	±0.6
Availability of Department of Defense school(s)	73	±1.0	12	±0.8	15	±0.8
Public safety in the local community (e.g., crime rates)	72	±0.8	14	±0.6	14	±0.6
Lack of affordable housing in the local community	42	±1.0	18	±0.8	40	±1.0
Base policy or duty requirements	34	±1.0	17	±0.8	47	±1.0
Quality of base housing	34	±0.8	28	±0.8	38	±1.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 5

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

¹This table excludes DDESS parents at West Point.

Parents' Evaluation of DDESS Education Programs

To more directly assess parents' view of the quality of DDESS schools, parents were asked to evaluate their child's DDESS school and its programs with the same A, B, C, D, and F grading system commonly used to evaluate students' performance. Evaluations were obtained for five specific programs, the overall academic program, and overall school quality (all referred to as "programs" below). Grade evaluations also were examined for all DDESS parents and for DDESS parents in three subgroups (by paygrade, child's grade-level, and experience with public schools).

Overall Findings

Parents graded the DDESS programs quite highly. Table 3.3 displays the distribution of grades given for each of the seven programs, listed according to the percentage of parents who graded the program with an A or a B. Each specific DDESS program was rated with an A by 42 to 50 percent of parents. The percentage of A grades given to the most central measures of school quality—the "overall quality of the school" and "overall academic program"—was 50 percent and 47 percent, respectively.

The last columns in Table 3.3 show each program's combined percentage for the two grades above *satisfactory* (a grade of C). At least 80 percent of parents rated each DDESS program this high (i.e., with an A (*excellent*) or B (*good*)).²⁰ Approximately one third (32%) rated *every* program with an A or a B. Parents who did not assign A or B grades typically assigned a grade of C. No more than five percent of parents gave any one DDESS program a grade of D (*poor*) or F (*fail*).

The relatively higher ratings for language arts and mathematics programs and lower ratings for science programs are not unique to DDESS schools. A similar pattern of ratings was found in a 1995 survey of the parents of DoD Dependents Schools (DoDDS) students (Caliber Associates, 1996) and in the *LEA Survey*. In the DoDDS survey, the percentage of parents who rated specific programs with an A or a

²⁰ This report frequently analyzes A-or-B grades in addition to or instead of the full range of grades. This A-or-B rating typically captures the findings for at least 80 percent of the respondents for an item. It also minimizes the number of cells with small sample sizes.

Table 3.3.

DDESS Parents' Grade Ratings of Selected DDESS Programs and of Overall School Quality

Program	Percent Assigning Grade to Each DDESS Program											
	A		B		C		D		F		A or B	
	Excellent		Good		Satisfactory		Poor		Fail		A or B	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Overall quality of the school	50	±1.0	37	±1.0	12	±0.6	2	±0.2	<1	±0.0	87	0.6
Reading/English/language arts program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	50	±1.0	37	±1.2	11	±0.6	2	±0.4	<1	±0.0	87	0.8
Mathematics program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	48	±1.0	38	±1.0	11	±0.8	2	±0.4	<1	±0.2	86	0.8
Special education programs (programs for disabled students)	50	±1.4	34	±1.4	12	±1.0	3	±0.4	1	±0.4	85	1.0
Overall academic program (e.g., variety of courses, challenging material)	47	±1.0	38	±1.2	13	±0.8	3	±0.2	<1	±0.2	84	1.0
Science program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	42	±1.0	40	±1.2	15	±0.8	3	±0.4	<1	±0.2	82	0.8
Support services provided by the school (testing and screening, individual counseling, assistance with course selection, and college and career guidance)	45	±1.2	35	±1.2	15	±0.8	4	±0.4	1	±0.2	80	1.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 2

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding. "A" and "B" percentages may not sum to "A or B" percentage due to rounding.

B was as follows: 75 percent for language arts, 72 percent for mathematics, and 62 percent for science.²¹ In the *LEA Survey*, the percentage of military parents who graded the programs in their child's schools with an A or a B was as follows: 68 percent for language arts, 67 percent for mathematics, and 62 percent for science (see Table 6.2 in Chapter 6).

One of the programs listed in the *DDESS Survey*—special education—is particularly relevant for parents of disabled students. Nine percent of DDESS parents who answered the survey indicated that they had a disabled child.²² Of this nine percent, 78 percent ($CI=\pm 2.7$) rated special education programs with an A or a B. This lower rating may reflect these parents' greater familiarity with or interest in special education programs. Relative to parents of other students, parents of disabled students may be more aware of the weaknesses of these programs or may expect more from these programs.

Subgroup Analyses

Parents' grade evaluations were also analyzed for differences among paygrade groups, levels of school that the parent's child attended, and whether or not the parent had a child who had ever attended a

²¹ The DoDDS survey did not ask about other specific school programs. The DoDDS survey data are based on over 43,000 respondents. Although the DoDDS report did not provide confidence intervals, an approximate 95% confidence interval for these reported percentages is $\pm 0.4\%$.

²² These were parents who indicated in the *DDESS Survey* that their child was "physically, emotionally, or learning disabled."

public school.²³ Table 3.4 presents the percentage of DDESS parents in each subgroup who assigned a grade of A or B to each of the seven school programs. In these analyses, many statistically significant differences of less than five percentage points were detected; the practical significance of these differences may be marginal. (The large sizes of many of the subgroups provide the statistical power necessary to detect small differences reliably.)

Table 3.4.

DDESS Parents' Grade Ratings of Selected DDESS Programs and of Overall School Quality, by Parent Group

Parent Group	Percent Grading DDESS Program with an A or a B													
	Overall school quality		Reading, English, & lang. arts		Math		Special education		Overall academics		Science		Support services	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
All DDESS parents	87	±0.6	87	±0.8	86	±0.8	85	±1.0	84	±1.0	82	±0.8	80	±1.0
Paygrade group														
Commissioned officers	91	±1.4	91	±1.4	90	±1.2	90	±1.6	89	±1.6	84	±1.8	86	±1.6
Senior enlisted & warrant officers	87	±1.4	87	±1.4	87	±1.4	85	±2.0	84	±1.6	84	±1.6	80	±1.6
Junior enlisted	85	±1.0	85	±1.0	84	±1.0	83	±1.2	83	±1.4	80	±1.2	79	±1.4
Level of school														
Elementary	88	±0.8	88	±0.8	87	±0.8	86	±1.2	85	±1.0	83	±1.0	82	±1.2
Middle	84	±2.5	83	±2.5	84	±2.0	81	±3.3	82	±2.7	81	±2.5	76	±2.9
High	84	±2.2	82	±2.4	84	±2.2	80	±3.7	79	±2.5	80	±2.5	74	±2.9
Public school experience														
Experienced	85	±0.8	86	±0.8	85	±0.8	84	±1.2	83	±1.2	81	±1.0	79	±1.2
Not experienced	90	±1.4	89	±1.4	89	±1.6	87	±2.2	87	±1.4	86	±1.8	84	±1.8

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 2g (grades), 18 (paygrade), 8 (school level), and 14, 15, and 16 (public school experience)

Paygrade differences. In general, proportionally more personnel at higher paygrades rated the seven programs with an A or a B than did personnel at lower paygrades (see Table 3.4). For all programs except science, commissioned officers gave significantly more A-or-B grades than did either senior enlisted/warrant officers or junior enlisted personnel. For example, 91 percent of commissioned officers rated overall school quality with an A or a B, compared to 87 percent of senior enlisted/warrant officers and 85 percent of junior enlisted personnel. Differences between ratings given by commissioned officers and senior enlisted/warrant officers ranged from 3 to 6 percentage points; for commissioned officers and junior enlisted personnel, differences ranged from 4 to 7 percentage points. Senior enlisted/warrant officers and junior enlisted personnel were more similar in their ratings, with differences of 1 to 4 percentage points and significantly different ratings for only mathematics and science programs.

²³ Responses to the 10 statements characterizing various aspects of DDESS schools were viewed as less direct and less easily interpreted measures of school quality than are school grade ratings. Thus, for the sake of brevity, this report does not discuss subgroup responses to those 10 statements. Table F.2 in Appendix F provides those findings.

These higher quality ratings given by commissioned officers could indicate that these personnel place a higher premium than do lower-ranked personnel on the education provided by the DDESS schools. These findings also could indicate that higher-ranked personnel are more sensitive to the implications of their survey responses for the DDESS transfer decision (which as we will later see, they strongly oppose). Being more aware of the potential loss of highly valued schools, commissioned officers may have exaggerated their ratings of the schools in an effort to forestall a transfer. This latter explanation is supported by findings from the *LEA Survey*. In that survey, higher-paygrade personnel did *not* rate LEA education programs higher than did personnel at lower paygrades.

Level-of-school differences. Table 3.4 shows that parents of elementary school students graded program quality higher than did parents of middle school and high school students. For five of the seven programs, the A-or-B ratings given by elementary parents were significantly (3 to 8 percentage points) higher than those given by either middle school or high school parents. The quality of support services, in particular, was rated higher at the elementary level than at the middle or high school level; 82 percent of elementary school parents rated support services with an A or a B, compared to 76 percent of middle school parents and 74 percent of high school parents. Middle school and high school parents did not differ in their ratings of program quality.

On the *LEA Survey*, parents of elementary school students in LEA schools also rated their schools higher than did parents of middle school and high school students. Data are not available to determine whether this higher rating for elementary schools is unique to the military population (or to schools serving many military students), or whether it applies to public school parents and public schools in general. There are many reasons why elementary schools may appear to parents to be run better than middle or high schools. For example, younger students may be easier to teach or discipline, or parents may be more involved in schools at that level (see, for example, Table F.2 in Appendix F). Parents of elementary students also tend to have less “school experience” in general and may have a slightly inflated view of their child’s school as a result of this lack of experience.

Public-school experience differences. For six of the seven comparisons (with special education being the exception), parents who have public school experience rated the quality of DDESS programs significantly lower than did parents without this experience. As shown in Table 3.4, the difference ranged from three to five percentage points, and was largest for ratings of overall school quality, science programs, and support services. This difference in ratings suggests that first-hand experience with the public schools may affect how parents view the DDESS schools. In particular, the slightly higher DDESS quality ratings given by parents without (versus those with) public school experience suggests that “inexperienced” DDESS parents may have a slightly exaggerated opinion of the quality of DDESS schools. Nonetheless, each program was graded A-or-B by over three quarters of the DDESS parents who have public school experience.

DDESS Parents’ Quality Ratings in Perspective

Findings in the prior section showed that most parents of DDESS students rated the quality of education in the DDESS schools quite highly. Although these findings provide useful information for evaluating the perceived quality of a DDESS education, additional information is needed to place the DDESS quality ratings in context. That context was established by three sets of comparisons. For the first set of comparisons, parents’ ratings of DDESS overall school quality were compared to two other sets of school-quality ratings provided by DDESS parents. More specifically, DDESS quality ratings were compared to ratings of education quality in local and U.S. public schools. A second set of comparisons

contrasted DDESS parents' ratings of DDESS schools to school quality ratings supplied in a national opinion poll and in the *LEA Survey*. The third set of comparisons looked at ratings supplied by comparable subgroups from the *DDESS* and *LEA Surveys*.

DDESS Parents' Ratings of DDESS, Local, and U.S. Schools

As shown in Table 3.5, DDESS parents rated DDESS schools significantly higher than they rated either local or U.S. public schools. Eighty-seven percent of parents rated the education quality of their DDESS school with an A or a B. In contrast, only 32 percent of the same parents gave the local public schools an A or a B, and only 28 percent gave U.S. public schools in general an A or a B. At the other extreme, only two percent of DDESS parents assigned grades of D or F to the DDESS schools, while 29 and 25 percent gave the local and U.S. schools a grade of D or F.

Table 3.5.

Parent Grade Ratings of Overall School Quality in DDESS, Local Schools and U.S. Public Schools

School Rated by DDESS Parent	Percent Assigning Grade to Each School											
	A Excellent		B Good		C Satisfactory		D Poor		F Fail		A or B	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
DDESS school	50	±1.0	37	±1.0	12	±0.6	2	±0.2	0	±0.0	87	±0.6
Local public school	6	±0.6	26	±1.0	39	±1.0	22	±0.8	7	±0.6	32	±1.0
U.S. public schools	3	±0.4	25	±0.8	47	±1.0	20	±0.8	5	±0.4	28	±1.0

Source: *DDESS Survey*, Questions 2g (DDESS school), 3Ad (local public school), and 3Bd (U.S. public schools)

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

Quality Ratings from Three Surveys

The pattern of results in Table 3.5 is not unique to DDESS schools or DDESS parents. The findings are typical of a pattern found in other surveys that ask parents to rate schools. The first three rows of Table 3.6 display the education-quality ratings of parents from three surveys: the *DDESS Survey*, a nationwide 1995 Gallup Poll²⁴ (Elam & Rose, 1995), and the *LEA Survey*. In all three surveys, parents rated their child's school higher than they did other schools. For example, in the Gallup Poll, 65 percent of public school parents rated their child's school with an A or a B, but only 20 percent rated U.S. public schools this high. In the *LEA Survey*, the respective percentages were 63 percent and 38 percent.

Thus, the most appropriate ratings to compare to DDESS parents' ratings of school quality are not DDESS parents' ratings of local and U.S. public schools, but the "own child's school" rating given by other groups of parents, particularly the Gallup Poll's nationally representative sample of public-school parents. As Table 3.6 shows, DDESS parents rated their child's school notably higher than did public school parents in general (from the Gallup Poll) or military parents in school districts that enroll relatively

²⁴ The *Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools* is an annual telephone survey of adults (age 18 and older). This poll explores education issues such as the public's grading of public schools; school choice; education financing; and Federal, state, and local roles in education policy. The poll was conducted in May through June 1995 using responses from a nationally representative sample of 1,311 adults. The Gallup Poll findings cited in this report are for the subgroup of respondents who had children in public schools. Parents' ratings of their child's school are for the oldest child in school.

high proportions of military-connected students (from the *LEA Survey*). While 87 percent of DDESS parents gave their child's school a grade of A or B, only 65 percent of Gallup Poll parents, and 63 percent of LEA parents, rated their child's school this high.²⁵

Table 3.6.
Parents' Rating of Overall School Quality from Three Surveys

Parent Group/Survey	Percent Grading Overall School Quality with A or B					
	Own child's school		Local public schools		U.S. public schools	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
<i>DDESS Survey</i> parents—full sample	87	±.06	32	±1.0	28	±1.0
<i>LEA Survey</i> parents—full sample	63	±1.2	not asked		38	±1.2
Gallup Poll parents ¹	65	*	49	*	20	*
<i>LEA Survey</i> parents in 7 coterminous LEAs	75	±2.7	not asked		36	±2.7
<i>DDESS Survey</i> parents at 6 installations near surveyed LEAs	85	±1.0	35	±1.6	29	±1.6
<i>LEA Survey</i> parents at 7 LEAs near DDESS installations	58	±4.5	not asked		40	±3.7

Source: *DDESS Survey*, Questions 2d, 3Ad, and 3Bd (DDESS parents' grades); *LEA Survey*, Questions 2g and 3d (LEA parents' grades); and *The 27th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools*.

¹ Local public school rating is for "public schools in your community." Ratings for U.S. public schools were adjusted to exclude the 13% who had responded "don't know."

*Approximate 95% confidence intervals for the Gallup Poll data are between ±4 and ±6 percentage points.

Quality Ratings for DDESS and LEA Subgroups

Two other sets of comparisons shed further light on DDESS parents' ratings of overall school quality. The first comparison provides additional insight into the relatively high rating given to the DDESS schools. The second comparison examines more closely DDESS parents' views of the local schools to which some of the DDESS schools could be transferred.

DDESS, coterminous LEAs, and all public schools. The *LEA Survey* contains a set of schools that makes an informative comparison group for evaluating the ratings of DDESS school quality. That survey included seven coterminous LEAs—LEAs whose boundaries are contiguous with the boundaries of a military installation. Like DDESS systems, coterminous LEAs are located on and enroll only children who reside on a military installation. As such, coterminous LEAs and DDESS systems share several characteristics that parents cited as reasons for wanting to keep the DDESS schools. These characteristics include a safe environment, a focus on the special needs of military children, and operation as a neighborhood school (see Chapter 4). In addition, coterminous LEAs are one alternative for administering the current DDESS systems. Parents' perceptions of school quality in existing coterminous LEAs thus

²⁵ The difference in ratings given to U.S. and local public schools versus "own child's" school was larger in the *DDESS Survey* than in the *LEA Survey* or the Gallup Poll. This larger difference is difficult to interpret because (a) DDESS parents rated public schools differently than did parents in the other two surveys and (b) as explained in the next section, DDESS parents' ratings of local schools seem to be affected by their DDESS experience.

gives some indication of how viable this transfer alternative is, at least as it relates to parents' concerns about school quality. (The next two chapters show that school quality was a major concern about the transfer issue.)

The fourth row of Table 3.6 shows that 75 percent of parents in coterminous LEAs rated the overall quality of their child's school with an A or a B. This rating was 12 percentage points below the rate for all DDESS parents and 10 points above the Gallup Poll rate for U.S. public school parents. The in-between rating for coterminous LEAs implies that *some* of the quality advantage enjoyed by DDESS schools (compared to U.S. public schools) derives from their status as on-base schools that serve only on-base children. The fact that the coterminous LEAs were rated higher than U.S. public schools (and higher than *LEA Survey* schools) also implies that a transfer to coterminous operation might alleviate some parents' concerns about school quality.

DDESS systems and their adjacent LEAs. Parents of DDESS students rated their neighboring local public schools fairly low. To better evaluate DDESS parents' ratings of local schools, comparable parents from the *DDESS Survey* and *LEA Survey* were examined. These surveys included seven LEAs in the *LEA Survey* that were located adjacent to six DDESS installations in the *DDESS Survey*. For these seven LEAs, we have comparable parent ratings of the same local public schools. The last two rows of Table 3.6 provide the ratings for these local schools from the two surveys.

DDESS parents rated the local school systems adjacent to their installation lower than did LEA parents. Only 35 percent of DDESS parents rated the local public schools with an A or a B, compared to 58 percent of military parents who had children in those same LEAs.²⁶ (DDESS parents' rating remained at 35% ($CI=\pm 2.0$) when the DDESS sample was restricted to only those parents who had a child attending school in the adjacent LEA. This was done to compensate for the "own school" bias in *LEA Survey* ratings.) DDESS parents may have a less positive view of the local schools than do their LEA counterparts because (a) the unique advantages of the DDESS schools may make the local schools look worse by comparison or (b) the fear of losing the DDESS schools in a transfer exaggerates DDESS parents' concerns about the local schools.

Interestingly, the overall quality rating given by LEA parents in the seven adjacent LEAs was five percentage points *below* that for the full LEA sample. This slightly lower rating given to LEAs near DDESS installations may reflect their location in the southeastern United States. Public schools in the southeast typically rate below average on national indicators of educational funding and achievement (Bodilly et al., 1988).

Summary

Parents with children enrolled in the DDESS schools have a high opinion of the quality of education provided by these schools. This high opinion encompassed not only the schools' instructional quality but, particularly, the safety and discipline provided by the schools and the level of parent involvement within the schools.

One factor that may contribute to the perceived quality of these schools is the extent to which parents have a voice in education decision-making in their child's DDESS school. Almost half of DDESS

²⁶ This pattern of findings was also consistent at each of the six DDESS installations, as shown in Appendix F, Table F.3.

parents felt that they have at least a large voice in these decisions. This is a much higher level of involvement than that expressed by military parents on the *LEA Survey*, suggesting that parent involvement is one of the strengths of the DDESS system. As another indication of how highly the DDESS schools are valued, many of those who live on an installation with a DDESS system reported that the availability of the DDESS schools was a major factor motivating their decision to live on-base.

Parents' ratings of DDESS school quality vary depending on characteristics of both the parents and the schools. Parents of higher rank rated the DDESS schools higher than those of lower rank, perhaps because of a greater awareness of the implications of the survey for transfer decisions. Parents of elementary school students also rated DDESS school quality higher than did parents of middle school or high school students. This finding is not unique to DDESS schools and may reflect more general differences between elementary schools and middle and high schools. Finally, parents who have public school experience (by virtue of having had a child enrolled in a public school) had a lower opinion of DDESS school quality than did those without this experience. This finding suggests that the latter group may have a slightly inflated view of DDESS school quality as a result of their inexperience. Regardless which subgroup one examines, however, parents' opinion of the quality of education provided by the DDESS schools was always high.

DDESS parents' opinions of DDESS schools were much higher than their opinions of their local public schools or of U.S. public schools in general. This higher opinion appears to reflect a general tendency in all parents' ratings—parents tend to rate the school their own child attends higher than they rate other schools. DDESS parents also gave lower ratings to the schools in their local areas than did other military parents. To the extent that this more negative view derives from an appreciation of the unique advantages offered by DDESS schools, it is an indication of the relative quality of DDESS schools. On the other hand, to the extent that this more negative view derives from concerns about a transfer, it is a biased opinion that should not be used to judge the relative quality of DDESS schools. In the latter case, the ratings of parents in the *LEA Survey* may be a better indicator of LEA school quality. Using this measure, DDESS schools were still rated about 30 percentage points higher than their local public schools.

More importantly, DDESS parents rated the quality of DDESS schools higher than parents in other surveys rated their own children's public schools. In particular, DDESS schools were given A-or-B ratings by 87 percent of DDESS parents, while U.S. public schools were rated A or B by only 65 percent of public-school parents. Almost half of this rating difference disappears when parents' ratings of schools in coterminous LEAs are examined. This finding implies that some of the features that make the DDESS schools so highly rated derive from their structure as schools that exclusively serve a military installation. Nonetheless, the higher rating for DDESS schools compared to coterminous schools suggests that DDESS schools have additional features that contribute to their (perceived) quality.

Chapter 4: Parents' Views on Transfer of DDESS Schools

This chapter examines the second major issue addressed in the *DDESS Survey*—parents' opinions on the possible transfer of DDESS schools to their local school districts. The first section of this chapter looks at whether parents support or oppose the potential transfer of their child's DDESS school to the local public school district. The second section examines the issues with which parents would be most concerned should a transfer take place. For each of these sections, findings for all DDESS parents are covered first; then, findings for each subgroup (based on paygrade, level of school, and public school experience) are reviewed. The third section reviews the relationship between parents' position on a potential transfer and a variety of factors, including school quality. The chapter ends with a fourth section summarizing key findings.

General Position Regarding Transfer

Overall Findings

Given DDESS parents' high regard for their schools (as reviewed in Chapter 3), it is not surprising that these parents opposed a transfer of DDESS schools to local school districts. Table 4.1 shows that more than 80 percent of DDESS parents opposed a transfer, with nearly three-quarters (73%) strongly opposing a transfer. Eleven percent were neutral or undecided on the issue, while only six percent supported transferring the DDESS schools to local school districts.

Table 4.1.

DDESS Parents' Position Regarding Transfer of DDESS Schools to Local School Districts

Position Regarding Transfer	Percent with Transfer Position	
	%	CI
Strongly oppose	73	±1.0
Oppose	10	±0.8
Neutral/undecided	11	±0.6
Support	3	±0.4
Strongly support	3	±0.4

Source: *DDESS Survey*, Question 6

Subgroup Findings

While a majority of parents in each subgroup opposed a transfer, opposition was stronger among some subgroups than others (see Table 4.2). Personnel at higher paygrades, for example, were more opposed to a transfer than were lower-paygrade personnel. The percentage of parents opposing a transfer increased from 79 percent for junior enlisted personnel to 84 percent for senior enlisted/warrant officers and 94 percent for commissioned officers. The larger percentage for higher-ranked personnel may reflect (a) a stronger education orientation among personnel who have a college education, and/or (b) a better sense of the possible implications of their survey responses for decisions on a transfer.

Table 4.2.

DDESS Parents' Position Regarding Transfer of DDESS Schools to Local School Districts, by Parent Group

Parent Group	Percent with Transfer Position ¹					
	Oppose		Neutral/Undecided		Support	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
All DDESS parents	83	±0.8	11	±0.6	6	±0.6
Paygrade group						
Commissioned officers	94	±1.2	3	±0.6	3	±0.8
Senior enlisted and warrant officers	84	±1.6	11	±1.2	6	±1.0
Junior enlisted	79	±1.2	14	±1.0	7	±0.8
Level of school						
Elementary school	83	±0.8	11	±0.8	5	±0.6
Middle school	84	±2.4	11	±1.8	5	±2.0
High school	83	±2.5	10	±2.2	8	±1.4
Public school experience						
Experienced	82	±1.0	12	±0.8	7	±0.6
Not experienced	86	±1.6	11	±1.4	4	±0.8

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 6 (position on transfer), 18 (paygrade), 8 (school level), and 14, 15, and 16 (public school experience)

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

¹ The “oppose” category includes parents who marked *strongly opposed* or *somewhat opposed*. The “support” category includes parents who marked *strongly support* or *somewhat support*.

Parents of elementary, middle, and high school students did *not* differ in their opposition to a transfer of the DDESS schools. This finding was obtained despite the fact that elementary schools were rated at a slightly higher quality level than were middle or high schools. Together, these results suggest that school quality may not be the only factor determining parents’ opposition to a transfer. More details about these additional factors are covered later in this chapter.

DDESS parents without public school experience were slightly (but significantly) more opposed to transferring the DDESS schools than were parents with public school experience. Eighty-six percent of inexperienced parents opposed a transfer, compared to 82 percent of experienced parents. Inexperienced parents may be more wary of moving their children to the local public schools because these schools are more of an “unknown quantity” to them.

Parents’ Concerns about a Transfer

Overall Findings

The uniformly negative opinions regarding a transfer lead to questions about what specific concerns parents have regarding a transfer. The *DDESS Survey* addressed this issue by including 11 concerns that might underlie parents’ opposition to a possible transfer. This list of concerns was developed from reviews of past studies (see annotated bibliography in Appendix A) and discussions with personnel from the DoD Education Activity (the office that oversees the DDESS schools). Table 4.3 provides a listing of these transfer concerns, rank-ordered from highest to lowest based on the percentage of parents who said they were *very concerned* about the issue. Nearly one-fourth (24%) of all respondents indicated that they would be *very concerned* about all 11 transfer issues.

Table 4.3.

DDESS Parents' Concerns if DDESS Schools Were Transferred to Local School Districts

Area of Concern	Percent at Each Level of Concern							
	Very concerned		Moderately concerned		Slightly concerned		Not concerned	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Student safety	85	±0.8	10	±0.6	3	±0.4	2	±0.2
Attention given to the needs of military students	78	±0.8	14	±0.8	5	±0.6	3	±0.4
Possibility of student busing or the loss of neighborhood schools	76	±1.0	15	±0.8	6	±0.4	4	±0.4
Quality of instruction	71	±0.8	20	±0.8	6	±0.6	3	±0.4
Educational staffing levels	68	±0.8	23	±0.8	7	±0.6	3	±0.4
Educational funding levels	67	±1.0	23	±1.0	7	±0.4	3	±0.4
Academic rigor of educational programs	65	±1.0	25	±1.0	7	±0.6	4	±0.4
Links to base services and programs	63	±1.0	24	±0.8	9	±0.4	5	±0.4
Variety of courses and educational programs	57	±1.0	29	±0.8	9	±0.6	5	±0.4
Ability to influence school policy	54	±1.0	28	±1.0	12	±0.6	6	±0.4
Availability of special education programs	43	±0.8	23	±1.0	14	±0.6	20	±1.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 7

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

From among these issues, DDESS parents were most concerned about “student safety.” Eighty-five percent of parents indicated that they would be *very concerned* about this issue if the DDESS schools were transferred. “Attention given to the needs of military students” and the “possibility of student busing or the loss of neighborhood schools” ranked as parents’ second and third most frequent concerns, respectively. Issues more directly related to education quality (i.e., “quality of instruction,” “education staffing levels,” “education funding levels,” and “academic rigor of educational programs”) ranked fourth through seventh. These rankings reinforce the comments made by both parents and other installation personnel in the site visits. In those visits, neighborhood schools, high-quality education programs, and accommodations made for the military lifestyle were often mentioned as valued features of the DDESS schools that personnel feared losing in a transfer. (Chapter 5 and Appendix G provide more details on site visit findings.)

“Availability of special education programs” ranked last of the 11 transfer issues, with 43 percent of all DDESS parents being *very concerned* about this issue. But among those parents whose children are typically served by special education programs, there was a relatively high degree of concern about this issue. For the subgroup of parents whose survey answers pertained to a disabled child, almost three-quarters (73%) indicated they would be *very concerned* about the availability of special education programs if the DDESS schools were transferred. This issue ranked fourth on the list of concerns for parents of disabled children. This relatively high level of concern suggests that DDESS schools are perceived to offer more extensive special education services than do local schools.

Although large percentages of parents in both the *DDESS Survey* and the site visits indicated that they were concerned about the possibility of student busing and/or the loss of neighborhood schools, this concern may be unfounded in many cases. At most DDESS sites, the superintendent of the local public schools indicated that the local school district could not absorb the DDESS school population into its existing facilities and would therefore prefer to keep students who reside on the installation in their current DDESS facilities. While many superintendents reserved the option of busing off-base students onto the installation, the greater concern of having students bused off the installation appears to be frequently

unwarranted (except for school districts that are under court-ordered busing decrees and for DDESS sites where very few students attend upper grades). Parents may have assumed that a transfer meant that the DDESS schools would close and that all students would be bused to schools in the adjacent school district.

Subgroup Findings

The ordering of transfer issues (by the percentage of parents who were *very concerned* about the issue) was very similar across paygrade groups, across school levels, and for parents with or without public school experience (see Table 4.4). The top four issues were identical across all comparison groups.

Looking at specific transfer issues, personnel at higher paygrades were more concerned than those at lower paygrades with issues directly related to education quality (i.e., “quality of instruction” and “academic rigor of educational programs”). For some other issues (“student safety,” “links to base services and programs,” “variety of courses and education programs,” and “availability of special education programs”), commissioned officers expressed less concern than those at lower paygrades. The three paygrade groups had the same level of concern for the remaining issues.

For most transfer issues, parents of elementary, middle, and high school students had the same level of concern. However, parents of younger students showed a higher level of concern with a few issues than did parents of older students. Elementary school parents were more concerned than were middle school parents with “links to base services and programs.” Elementary and middle school parents were more concerned than high school parents with the “variety of courses and education programs” and the “availability of special education programs.”

Not surprisingly, parents with no public school experience had a higher level of concern than did those with such experience about most issues. Again, inexperienced parents’ lack of first-hand experience with public schools may have made these parents more distrustful of conditions in the local schools.

Factors Related to Position on Transfer

School Quality and Position on Transfer

Intuitively, one would expect a parent’s position on a possible DDESS transfer to be related to the parent’s opinion on the quality of education provided by both the DDESS schools and the local schools to which the DDESS schools would be transferred. The first three rows in Table 4.5 show that parents’ position on a potential transfer is in fact related to the overall quality rating given the DDESS school their child attends. Parents who gave their DDESS school a higher grade were more likely to oppose a transfer than were parents who gave the DDESS school a lower grade. The middle three rows in Table 4.5 show a similar, expected pattern for ratings of local school quality and opinion on transfer. Parents who graded the local schools lower were more likely to oppose a transfer than were parents who gave the local schools a higher quality rating. (These overall school quality ratings were explained in more detail in Chapter 3.)

Table 4.4.
DDESS Parents' Concerns about a Transfer, by Parent Group

Parent Group	Percent “Very Concerned” about the Transfer Issue																					
	Student safety		Attention to military child’s needs		Busing or loss of neighborhood schools		Quality of instruction		Education staffing levels		Education funding levels		Academic rigor of education program		Links to base services and programs		Variety of courses and education programs		Ability to influence school policy		Avail-ability of special education programs	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
All DDESS parents	85	±0.8	78	±0.8	76	±1.0	71	±0.8	68	±0.8	67	±1.0	65	±1.0	63	±1.0	57	±1.0	54	±1.0	43	±0.8
Paygrade group																						
Commissioned officers	82	±1.6	78	±1.8	75	±1.6	75	±1.8	69	±2.0	68	±2.0	70	±2.0	56	±2.0	54	±2.2	56	±1.8	33	±2.2
Senior enlisted & warrant officers	86	±1.2	78	±1.6	76	±1.8	74	±1.8	68	±1.4	69	±1.6	66	±2.0	64	±1.8	59	±1.8	54	±1.8	45	±1.6
Junior enlisted	86	±1.0	79	±1.2	76	±1.2	69	±1.0	67	±1.2	66	±1.6	62	±1.4	64	±1.4	56	±1.4	53	±1.4	44	±1.2
Level of school																						
Elementary	85	±0.8	79	±1.0	76	±1.0	71	±1.0	68	±1.2	68	±1.2	64	±1.0	64	±1.2	57	±1.2	54	±1.2	43	±1.0
Middle	85	±2.0	77	±2.4	75	±2.5	75	±2.9	66	±3.1	65	±3.7	66	±2.7	59	±3.3	58	±2.5	54	±2.9	43	±2.9
High	85	±2.4	76	±2.4	73	±2.9	70	±2.5	64	±3.1	65	±2.9	65	±2.7	60	±3.5	52	±3.1	53	±3.5	38	±2.9
Public school experience																						
Experienced	84	±1.0	77	±1.0	74	±1.2	71	±1.0	66	±1.2	66	±1.2	64	±1.2	61	±1.2	56	±1.2	53	±1.2	42	±1.2
Not experienced	88	±1.2	81	±1.6	79	±1.8	72	±1.8	71	±1.8	69	±1.8	66	±1.8	68	±1.8	60	±1.8	57	±1.8	44	±1.6

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 7 (transfer issues), 18 (paygrade), 8 (school level), and 14, 15, and 16 (public school experience)

Table 4.5.

Relationship between DDESS Parents' Rating of School Quality and Position on Transferring DDESS Schools

Rating for Overall School Quality	Percent Giving Rating Who Have Each Transfer Position							
	Overall Percent Giving Rating		Oppose		Neutral/ Undecided		Support	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
DDESS Schools								
A or B	87	±0.6	87	±0.8	9	±0.6	4	±0.4
C	12	±0.6	59	±3.1	25	±2.5	17	±2.5
D or F	2	±0.2	44	±8.8	18	±5.7	38	±7.4
Local Schools								
A or B	32	±1.0	68	±2.0	20	±1.6	11	±1.4
C	39	±1.0	85	±1.2	10	±1.0	5	±1.0
D or F	30	±1.0	96	±0.8	2	±0.6	2	±0.6
DDESS vs. Local Schools								
Local rated higher	5	±0.6	38	±5.1	26	±5.5	35	±5.7
DDESS and local rated same	23	±1.0	64	±2.4	23	±1.8	13	±1.8
DDESS rated 1 or 2 grades higher	55	±1.4	90	±1.0	8	±1.0	3	±0.4
DDESS rated 3 or 4 grades higher	18	±0.8	99	±0.6	1	±0.4	0	±0.4

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 6 (position on transfer), 2 (grade for DDESS school's overall school quality), and 3 (grade for local schools' overall school quality)

Note: Rows and columns may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

When considering the implications of a transfer, a more critical issue for parents may be whether the DDESS schools provide a *better* education than do local schools (not just whether DDESS schools or local schools provide a high-quality education). In other words, it may be the relative quality of DDESS schools compared to local schools that most affects parents' views on transfer. To examine this relationship, parents were grouped into four categories based on their grade-ratings of overall school quality in DDESS versus local schools. Not surprisingly, most DDESS parents (73%) rated DDESS schools higher than local schools. Twenty-three percent rated the two types of schools the same, and only 5 percent rated local schools higher than DDESS schools.

As shown in Table 4.5, virtually every parent (99%) who rated a DDESS school at least three grades higher than local schools opposed a transfer. A slightly smaller percentage (90%) of the parents who rated DDESS schools one or two grades higher opposed a transfer. Among parents who graded the DDESS and local schools at the same level, 64 percent opposed a transfer of the DDESS school. Finally, 38 percent of those who rated local schools higher than DDESS schools opposed a transfer. Thus, even when school quality was not an issue, some parent opposition to a transfer remained. This finding suggests that although a concern about educational quality may be an important determinant of parents' views on the transfer issue, it is not the only factor that motivates DDESS parents to oppose a transfer (as Chapter 5 also demonstrates). We now look at other factors that might affect parents' position on a potential transfer.

General Factors Related to Position on Transfer

From findings discussed thus far, it appears that parents' opposition to a transfer may be related to factors that include parent's paygrade, whether the parent has experience with public schools, the child's school level, the relative quality of DDESS schools, and concerns about "non-quality" issues (i.e., student safety, attention given to the special needs of military children, busing/loss of neighborhood schools, and

the links between the child's school and base services²⁷). Multiple regression was used to examine the "unique" relationship between this group of five variables and parents' position on a potential transfer of the DDESS schools. The regression analysis allowed for the simultaneous examination of the relationship between each of these five variables and parents' position on transfer.

This analysis revealed that all of these variables except school level were significantly related to parents' position on a transfer.²⁸ Parents at higher paygrades (defined in this analysis as commissioned officers) were more opposed to a transfer than were parents at lower paygrades, regardless of their views on relative school quality or on non-quality issues, their child's grade level, or their public school experience. A significant and independent relationship also existed between position on transfer and the relative quality of the DDESS schools (higher the relative quality, more opposed to transfer). Similarly, parents more concerned with non-quality issues were more opposed to transfer than were parents who were less concerned with these issues. In the case of parent public school experience, inexperienced parents were more opposed to transfer. The non-significant finding for school level means that elementary parents were no more opposed to a transfer than were middle school and high school parents, when the effects of other variables were statistically controlled.

Parents' rating of relative school quality and their level of concern about non-quality issues were much more strongly related to their position on transfer than were parents' paygrade or public-school experience. Moreover, parents' opinions on relative school quality and non-quality issues had the same degree of relationship to parents' transfer position. This similar level of relationship suggests that changing parent views on the relative quality of DDESS schools and addressing parent concerns about issues other than education quality (e.g., meeting special needs of military children, loss of neighborhood schools) would have similar effects on changing DDESS parents' position on transferring the schools.

Summary

Parents of DDESS students strongly and overwhelmingly opposed transferring DDESS schools to their local public school districts. Opposition increased with the parents' paygrade, most likely reflecting the greater focus higher-ranking personnel have on education issues and/or on the implications of this survey concerning decisions on a potential transfer. Nonetheless, even large percentages of personnel at lower paygrades (junior enlisted) opposed a transfer. Relative to parents with no prior public school experience, fewer parents with public school experience opposed a transfer. This difference may indicate a greater distrust of public schools among those who have not had children in these schools. Both groups were, however, strongly opposed to a transfer.

Parents have many concerns about a possible transfer. Concerns about student safety, the special needs of military children, and the possibility of busing or the loss of neighborhood schools topped the list, followed by concerns related to school quality (such as instructional quality). Among parents of children

²⁷ These four issues were selected based on the results of a factor analysis performed on the set of 11 transfer issues. In that analysis, these four issues formed one factor representing an underlying concern with "non-quality" issues. In the regression analysis, this factor was included as a single variable representing the parent's average response across the four "non-quality" issues. The "quality issues" factor (from the factor analysis) was replaced in the current analysis with the parent's rating of the relative quality of the DDESS school compared to the local public schools.

²⁸ Regression results are listed in Appendix F, Table F.4.

with disabilities, the availability of special education programs was also a major concern. If any of the DDESS schools are transferred, officials responsible for the transfer will undoubtedly be asked to address these concerns. One concern that should be easily addressed at most installations is the fear of busing and/or the loss of neighborhood schools. Information obtained during the site visits suggested that DDESS students at many sites will remain in their current school facilities if a transfer occurs.

Parents' position on a transfer (i.e., how strongly they support or oppose a transfer) is related to a number of factors. First, the more highly parents view the quality of their child's DDESS school relative to the local schools, the more likely they are to oppose a transfer. Logically, parents should be more opposed to transferring their children to public schools when those schools appear to be a relatively worse alternative; however, it is also possible that parents who opposed a transfer for reasons other than quality tended to exaggerate the relative quality of the DDESS schools. Either way, parents' rating of relative school quality was strongly related to parents' position on a transfer. Equally important was the extent to which parents were concerned about issues other than education quality (i.e., student safety, meeting special needs of military children, concerns over busing or loss of neighborhood schools, links to base services). As will be seen in Chapter 5, these concerns, as well as concerns about education quality, were also raised in the site visits.

Chapter 5: DDESS Quality and Transfer by Installation

A transfer of the DDESS students to local public schools would have to be carefully evaluated and negotiated at each of the 15 military installations with DDESS systems. With this fact in mind, this chapter further examines DDESS school quality and transfer, focusing on findings at each DDESS site. Specifically, the first section reviews installation-level findings on parents' opinions of overall school quality and their position on a potential transfer. This section is based on parents' responses to the *DDESS Survey*. The second section summarizes transfer issues raised during the site visits and state-level telephone interviews. Those findings focus on the views expressed by installation commanders and DDESS, LEA, and state education officials (as well as the views of DDESS parents and other groups who requested impromptu meetings). The third section provides a brief overview of each DDESS site and a discussion of the factors facilitating or impeding a transfer of each DDESS system. Key findings are summarized in the fourth section of the chapter.

Two caveats are necessary. First, Fort McClellan is scheduled to close in 1999. This installation closure makes the transfer of the Fort McClellan DDESS system moot since the DDESS school will close along with the installation. Nonetheless, this chapter (and the remainder of the report) includes Fort McClellan in its analysis. Second, the state-level and site-visit interviews assumed that the transfer option under consideration was a full transfer to the local public school system. This is a more limited focus than that of previous studies that were designed to consider *transfer options* (e.g., Bodilly et al., 1988; GAO, 1986); these latter studies included the possibility of a "partial" transfer, contract arrangement, and/or coterminous arrangement.

DDESS Survey Findings

This section examines *DDESS Survey* findings separately for each of the 15 installations with a DDESS system. Three sets of findings are discussed: (a) parents' opinions of DDESS school quality, (b) their position on a transfer, and (c) their concerns about a potential transfer.

Parents' Opinions on School Quality

Chapter 3 showed that DDESS parents rated the quality of education in DDESS schools quite highly. This finding holds across the 15 installations (see Table 5.1). The percentage of parents rating the overall quality of the DDESS school with an A or a B was quite high and fairly stable across all 15 installations, ranging from 81 percent at Camp Lejeune to 99 percent at Dahlgren.

Not surprisingly, DDESS parents' ratings of local school quality were consistently lower than their DDESS school quality ratings.²⁹ Table 5.1 also shows that ratings of local school quality varied more than DDESS quality ratings from installation to installation. The percentage of parents rating the overall quality of local public schools with an A or a B ranged from 6 percent at Maxwell AFB to 46 percent at Fort Stewart. The greater variability in (perceived) quality in local public schools may reflect the fact that public schools are influenced by Federal, state, and local policies; DDESS schools are predominantly influenced by only Federal (DoD Education Activity) policies.

²⁹ Appendix F Tables F.5 and F.6 list the full range of grade ratings given to DDESS schools and LEA schools (respectively) at each installation.

Table 5.1.

DDESS Parents' Ratings of Overall School Quality and Opposition to Transfer, by Installation

Installation	Percent Rating School A or B				Percent Rating DDESS Higher than LEA ¹		Percent Opposed to Transfer	
	DDESS School		LEA School					
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Maxwell AFB	89	±0.2	6	±0.0	94	±0.2	95	±0.2
West Point	95	±0.0	23	±0.2	87	±0.2	92	±0.2
Dahlgren NSWC	99	±0.0	30	±0.2	86	±0.2	92	±0.2
Quantico MCB	93	±1.4	31	±2.9	80	±2.4	91	±1.4
Ft. Benning	92	±2.2	30	±3.1	78	±3.3	88	±2.2
Laurel Bay MCB	88	±2.2	16	±2.7	85	±2.5	86	±3.1
Ft. Knox	85	±2.4	31	±2.7	70	±2.7	85	±2.4
Robins AFB	87	±0.0	36	±0.2	73	±0.2	83	±0.2
Ft. Bragg	87	±2.4	31	±2.5	73	±3.1	82	±3.1
Camp Lejeune	81	±2.0	34	±2.9	69	±2.9	82	±2.4
Ft. Jackson	89	±2.4	39	±4.5	68	±3.9	82	±3.9
Ft. Rucker	90	±2.5	34	±2.7	72	±2.9	80	±3.1
Ft. Campbell	83	±2.5	35	±3.9	68	±3.9	79	±3.3
Ft. McClellan	87	±0.2	25	±0.2	80	±0.2	78	±0.4
Ft. Stewart	86	±3.7	46	±4.9	64	±5.7	71	±5.1

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 2, 3 (school ratings) and 6 (opposition to transfer)

¹DDESS overall school quality was rated 1 or more grades higher than LEA overall school quality.

Again, more informative data for understanding parents' views on a transfer come from parents' perceptions of the *relative* quality of the DDESS school compared to local schools. Table 5.1 shows that at each installation, at least 64 percent of the parents rated DDESS schools higher than local public schools. However, the percentages varied widely among installations, ranging from a low of 64 percent at Fort Stewart (the site where local schools were rated highest) to a high of 94 percent at Maxwell AFB (the site where local schools were rated lowest). Maxwell, West Point, Dahlgren, and Laurel Bay are the installations where DDESS schools were most often rated higher than local schools; Fort Knox, Camp Lejeune, Fort Campbell, Fort Jackson, and Fort Stewart are the installations where DDESS schools were least often rated higher than local schools.

Parents' Position on Transfer

Chapter 4 showed that the vast majority of parents of DDESS students opposed a transfer of DDESS schools to local public schools. This finding also held across installations (see Table 5.1).³⁰ Although the percentage of parents opposed to transferring the DDESS schools varied by more than 20 percentage points from one installation to another, at no installation were fewer than 71 percent of parents opposed to a transfer.

Installations where more parents viewed DDESS schools as better than local schools were also installations where more parents were opposed to a transfer. That is, the order of installations by opposition to transfer largely reflects the order of installations by relative DDESS quality. Maxwell, West Point, and Dahlgren, for example, top both lists (most parents rating DDESS higher and most parents opposed to transfer), while Fort Campbell and Fort Stewart are at or near the bottom of both lists (fewest rating DDESS higher and fewest opposed to transfer). One notable exception to this pattern is Fort

³⁰ Appendix F Table F.7 lists a wider range of positions on transfer at each installation.

McClellan. At that installation, 87 percent of parents rated DDESS schools higher than the local schools, but only 78 percent opposed a transfer. Parents' concern about a transfer at this installation may have been lessened by the knowledge that Fort McClellan is scheduled to close in 1999.

Parents' Concerns Regarding Transfer

Given the range in views on education quality and transfer across installations, it is surprising how consistent parents were across most installations in their main concerns about a potential transfer. Table 5.2 rank orders, by installation, the 11 transfer concerns listed in the *DDESS Survey*.³¹ As seen in this table, student safety, attention to the needs of military students, and the possibility of student busing or the loss of neighborhood schools were the top concerns at most installations.

Four installations—Fort Rucker, Maxwell, Dahlgren, and West Point—show a different pattern of concerns. At these installations, issues more directly related to school quality (i.e., quality of instruction, educational staffing levels, educational funding levels, and academic rigor of educational programs) fell higher on these parents' lists of concerns than they did at other installations. Interestingly, these four installations are among the six with the highest proportions of highly-educated DDESS parents. Across all installations, 18 percent of DDESS parents have at least 16 years of education, but at these four installations, the proportions are 28 percent, 45 percent, 24 percent, and 79 percent, respectively. In addition, all four installations have missions that are educationally oriented—Three are training installations, and the fourth (Dahlgren) is a research and development installation. Three of the four (all except Fort Rucker) also top the list of installations where the highest percentage of parents opposed a transfer.

It is important to note that even the lowest-ranked transfer issues listed in Table 5.2 were serious concerns for most DDESS parents. For example, over half the parents at most installations indicated that they were *very concerned* about the “variety of courses and educational programs” that would be offered after a transfer and about their “ability to influence school policy.” Only one-third to one-half of parents at each installation were *very concerned* about the “availability of special education programs.” However, as discussed in Chapter 4, this issue was a more serious concern among the parents of disabled students.

Factors Explaining Installation Differences on Transfer Position

Why are parents more opposed to a transfer at one installation rather than another? Chapter 4 showed that, for the total group of DDESS parents, opposition to a transfer was related to four factors: (a) parents' paygrade level, (b) parents' view of the relative quality of DDESS schools (compared to local schools), (c) parent concerns about non-quality school issues (i.e., student safety, neighborhood schools/busing, the needs of military students, and links to base services), and (d) parent public-school experience.

These factors also seem to be related to the level of opposition to transfer among parents at one installation versus another. Table 5.3 provides a listing of these four factors, and of the percent of parents opposed to transfer, for each of the 15 military installations with DDESS schools. This table shows that the percent of parents opposed to transfer tends to be higher at installations with high percentages of commissioned officers, high percentages of parents rating DDESS schools higher than LEA schools, high percentages of parents *very concerned* with all four non-quality transfer issues, and low percentages of parents with public school experience.

³¹ Appendix F Table F.8 lists the percentage of parents at each installation who indicated they were *very concerned* about each issue.

Table 5.2.
Rank Order of Transfer Issues at Each Installation¹

Transfer Issues	Rank of Transfer Issue at Each Installation														
	Robins AFB	Camp Lejeune	Ft. Bragg	Ft. Stewart	Ft. Knox	Ft. Jackson	Quantico MCB	Laurel Bay MCB	Ft. McClellan	Ft. Benning	Ft. Campbell	Ft. Rucker	Maxwell AFB	Dahlgren NSWC	West Point
Student safety	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4
Attention given to the needs of military students	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	5	7	4	6
Possibility of student busing or the loss of neighborhood schools	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	7	2	2	6	6	7	7
Quality of instruction	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	5	4	4	2	3	1	2
Educational staffing levels	5	5	6	6	7	7	4	6	4	5	6	4	4	5	3
Educational funding levels	6	6	5	7	5	6	8	8	3	6	5	3	2	6	1
Academic rigor of educational programs	7	8	7	8	8	8	6	5	6	7	8	7	5	2	5
Links to base services and programs	8	7	8	5	6	4	7	7	9	8	7	9	9	9	10
Variety of courses and educational programs	10	10	9	9	10	9	10	9	8	9	9	8	8	10	8
Ability to influence school policy	9	9	10	10	9	10	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	9
Availability of special education programs	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 7

¹Ranks are based on the percentage of parents at each installation who indicated that they were *very concerned* about an issue.

These findings suggest that parents will be more receptive to the notion of a transfer if (a) certain non-quality issues (i.e., student safety, neighborhood schools/busing, needs of military students, links to base services) can be resolved and (b) parents can be assured that the current level of education quality provided by the DDESS schools would not be compromised. Any transfer initiatives that do not address these two factors are likely to meet significant parent opposition. The site visits and state telephone interviews provide additional information on these and other issues that affect the ease with which a transfer could occur at each DDESS site. This chapter now turns to those findings.

Table 5.3.

Factors Affecting Installation Differences in Parents' Position on Transfer

Installation	Commissioned Officers ¹	Rate DDESS Higher ²	Non-quality Transfer Issues ³	Public School Experience ⁴	Opposed to transfer ⁵
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Maxwell AFB	47	94	44	72	95
West Point	73	87	40	67	92
Dahlgren NSWC	21	86	47	82	92
Quantico MCB	43	80	51	73	91
Ft. Benning	12	78	62	72	88
Ft. Knox	14	70	58	69	85
Laurel Bay MCB	14	85	53	70	86
Robins AFB	12	73	43	65	83
Ft. Bragg	16	73	52	72	82
Camp Lejeune	16	70	47	77	82
Ft. Jackson	7	69	59	73	82
Ft. Rucker	13	72	43	61	80
Ft. Campbell	9	68	51	75	79
Ft. McClellan	20	80	44	75	78
Ft. Stewart	6	64	43	78	71

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 18 (commissioned officers), 2, 3 (school ratings), 7 (transfer issues), 14, 15, 16 (public school experience), and 6 (opposition to transfer)

¹ Percent of installation personnel who are commissioned officers.

² Percent of parents rating overall quality of DDESS schools one or more grades higher than overall quality in local schools.

³ Percent of parents indicating they would be *very concerned* with all four non-quality transfer issues.

⁴ Percent of parents indicating they had public school experience.

⁵ Percent of parents indicating that they would be *strongly opposed* or *somewhat opposed* to the transfer of DDESS schools.

State, Local, and Installation Views on Transfer

As discussed in Chapter 2, the site visits to the 15 installations with DDESS systems included interviews with the DDESS superintendent, the military installation commander (or a designated representative), and the superintendent(s) of the LEA(s) that could assume responsibility for the current DDESS students if a transfer were to occur. At most sites, the DDESS superintendent also arranged for informal interviews with various groups (DDESS school boards, DDESS teachers' union representatives, DDESS administrative or teaching staff, and/or parents of DDESS students) that would be affected by a transfer. Telephone interviews also were conducted with state education officials in the eight states that could assume responsibility for the current DDESS students.

This section presents the major views on and concerns about a potential transfer of DDESS schools obtained from these data collections. The section starts with local and state personnel's general opinions about a transfer and the related issue of responsibility for educating military-connected students. Installation personnel's views on a potential transfer are also reviewed. The section then examines transfer issues that were common across all 15 DDESS sites, followed by a review of transfer concerns that were specific to one or a few sites. The section concludes with capsule summaries of each of the 15 DDESS sites, focusing on the specific factors that would *facilitate* or *impede* a transfer at that site.³²

³² Full summaries of the site visits are contained in Appendix G. Appendix H lists the state interview summaries.

General Opinions

Local and state views. The local site visits and state telephone interviews revealed that, in every case, state and local education officials acknowledged their responsibility for educating all students within their jurisdictions, including those who live on military installations. Nevertheless, none of these officials actively sought the additional responsibility of educating current DDESS students. In general, while these officials did not actively support a transfer, they were also typically not strongly opposed to the idea—as long as the Federal government provided adequate reimbursement.

More specifically, LEAs' opinions on transfer are best summarized as follows. The LEAs are pleased with the current situation. Both the installations and their surrounding communities are satisfied with existing arrangements that they believe are working well. As a result, no LEA is interested in altering the current educational arrangements. LEA administrators realize that any change to the status quo is likely to create short- and long-term problems, including engendering hard feelings between the communities and their neighboring installation, and possibly among communities around an installation. Many LEAs also are concerned about whether they would receive adequate funding after a transfer. On the other hand, those LEAs at sites where more than one LEA could receive the DDESS students are concerned about a potential *loss* of enrollments and/or funding (e.g., if all military-connected students were transferred to another LEA). Thus, at these sites, LEAs that currently educate many military-connected students are typically willing to “fight” to win jurisdiction over the current DDESS students. Again, however, the desire to maintain cordial relations among installations and communities makes the prospect of a transfer less appealing to LEAs than a continuation of the current arrangement.

State education officials typically conditioned their transfer views on the receipt of adequate Federal funding. With sufficient Federal funds, most states (Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, South Carolina, and New York) would support a transfer; without these funds, they would not support a transfer. Three states (Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia) took a neutral stance on the transfer issue.

Assuming a transfer were to occur, states and LEAs were often concerned about the increased financial burden that would be imposed on state and local educational agencies, and by extension, on the local communities. Most of the school districts around these 15 installations have growing populations, overcrowded schools, and difficulty keeping up with the funding needs of their growing enrollments. This situation, combined with a distrust of the future of Impact Aid, made Federal funding the primary state and LEA issue across sites.

Installation views. On-base personnel—installation commanders (or their representatives), DDESS superintendents, and other DDESS personnel—were typically strongly opposed to a transfer of DDESS students to local public schools. Their concerns typically focused on educational issues. The general opinion at all sites was that the DDESS schools provide many educational benefits not available in the local communities. Installation personnel did not want to relinquish these benefits. The loss of DDESS schools also was perceived as a further decline in the quality-of-life benefits provided to military personnel and their families. Installation personnel were concerned about the implications of the loss of such a valued benefit on military morale and readiness.

The sections below review in more detail these and other transfer issues raised by state, local and installation personnel.

Generic Transfer Issues

This section reviews the transfer issues that would have to be addressed at every DDESS site. Although there is some overlap, these transfer issues can be divided into two categories: concerns of installation personnel, and concerns of state and LEA officials. To make a transfer more acceptable to installation personnel, issues that would need to be addressed include concerns about educational programs and school functioning, transition of personnel, and the perception that a transfer would entail the loss of a military benefit. To make a transfer more feasible for states and local school districts, needs for school facilities and adequate funding would have to be addressed.

Education quality. Installation personnel (including DDESS superintendents and other DDESS representatives) were typically very concerned about the implications of a transfer on the quality of education received by current DDESS students. Their concerns were based on the belief that DDESS schools provide a better education than do schools in adjacent school districts. Compared to local schools, DDESS schools were typically viewed as having more or better resources—smaller class sizes, less crowded schools, more computers, more extensive special education and pre-school programs, more support staff, and more financial resources in general.

Installation personnel also believed that the safe, all-military environment of the schools made the DDESS schools a better environment for learning. Many DDESS personnel mentioned the ability to use the military chain-of-command as an efficient and effective way to resolve disciplinary problems in the DDESS schools. These personnel believed that the discipline and structure of the DDESS schools allow the schools' staff to focus on student learning to a greater extent than is possible in the public schools.

Special support for military children. Installation personnel also indicated that DDESS schools focus on the needs of military children. They noted that DDESS schools offer special programs and services to integrate new students into the school, provide counseling for students whose parents are deployed, and make special accommodations for military family schedules.

All DDESS school systems have comprehensive programs and support staff in place for both arriving and departing students. Instruction for departing students is often accelerated to insure completion of requirements before the students move to their (parents') next military assignment. At installations with personnel subject to short-notice deployments (e.g., Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Stewart, and Camp Lejeune), school counseling programs (often in cooperation with on-base family support services) help students deal with the stress of having a parent on deployment. Local schools were viewed as less willing or able to make these (or other) special accommodations.

Neighborhood schools. DDESS schools also were seen as providing special benefits because they function as neighborhood schools. These benefits include a well-regulated, safe environment within and around the school facilities; strong links between the schools and other installation services and programs (e.g., medical facilities, community and family support centers, substance abuse counseling); the use of school facilities for the installation's community activities; a high level of parent volunteerism in the schools; and the ability to resolve within-school problems through the military chain-of-command. DDESS parents and superintendents fear that these positive features would be lost if control of the schools were transferred to LEAs—especially if the transfer involved busing students onto or off the installation.

Quality-of-life benefits. Installation commanders were concerned about how the loss of the DDESS system would affect the military personnel under their command. Largely because of the advantages listed above, DDESS schools were commonly viewed—by installation commanders, DDESS

superintendents, and other installation personnel—as a valued quality-of-life benefit and a positive inducement for continued enlistment and retention.

Installation commanders noted that military quality-of-life benefits have been declining. They believed that the loss of another of these benefits would have a negative effect on troop morale, lowering both retention rates and readiness levels. Installation commanders were also concerned that the loss of DDESS schools would make assignments to their installations less desirable. This concern was particularly strong at installations where military personnel are assigned for training, and where, if a transfer occurred, children living on the installation might be required to attend schools off the installation (e.g., Maxwell AFB).

School board representation. DDESS school board members and DDESS parents in general were concerned about losing their ability to influence school policy if the DDESS schools were transferred. The DDESS systems allow military parent representation on a school board at each DDESS site. The local school districts to which the DDESS students would be transferred either appoint or elect their school boards. Eligibility for appointment or participation in local school board elections usually requires residency in the relevant state or school district. Since DDESS parents often are not residents of the state in which they reside, they often would be ineligible for appointment or election to local school boards, or even to participate in the election of school board members. Discussions with LEA superintendents revealed few options to allow official representation of non-resident military parents on local school boards. At some of the larger installations (e.g., Fort Knox, Fort Bragg, Fort Rucker), the local school districts were more willing to provide for informal or nonvoting military representation. The state of Georgia (containing Fort Benning, Fort Stewart and Robins AFB) also supported non-voting school board representation for military personnel.

Personnel issues. The staff and faculty of the DDESS schools are Federal employees. For these employees, transfer of the DDESS schools would result in a loss of job or a change of employer. LEA officials typically indicated they would have employment opportunities for most of the current DDESS staffs; however, whether positions would be available for *all* current DDESS personnel was unclear. DDESS staff are thus concerned about job security, as well as other conditions of employment if a transfer were to occur. Since DDESS staff are typically paid higher salaries than local school personnel, pay levels are an issue. Seniority, tenure, teaching certification, and employee benefits are other personnel issues that would need to be resolved. For example, DDESS employees would probably not be able to convert their investment in the Federal retirement program into a state's retirement system unless a group buy-in option were incorporated into the conditions of employment.

Facilities needs. Most of the communities around these installations are experiencing population growth, with concomitant growth in their student enrollments. Because of this growth and (in many cases) the sheer size of the DDESS systems, none of local school systems could accommodate the additional DDESS students without owning or otherwise having access to existing DDESS facilities.

LEA ownership of facilities within the military installations raises several issues. State education officials and LEA superintendents were quick to point out that the DDESS facilities would have to meet state and local building code requirements before the LEA could accept ownership. Questions about jurisdictional arrangements for police and fire protection would also have to be addressed. For example, could on-base fire departments provide coverage to the on-base schools if these schools belonged to the LEA? Would military police have any jurisdiction at these schools? Some precedent for resolving these facilities issues exists, as there are many locations where on-base schools are owned and/or operated by local public school districts (e.g., the seven coterminous LEAs included in the *LEA Survey*).

Federal funds. Transferring DDESS students to a local school district would increase, sometimes significantly, the number of students for which the district is responsible. State and LEA representatives noted that funding levels would need to increase proportionally if the local schools are to maintain existing education programs and overall education quality levels. Both state and LEA officials maintained that transfer arrangements which lowered current LEA funding levels would be unacceptable.

According to state education officials, all states except Georgia would provide their normal state share of per-pupil funding for the current DDESS students if these students were transferred to local educational agencies.³³ Local school districts would typically have to raise local property taxes in order to cover local education contributions and continue funding at current per-pupil levels. This option is unacceptable to all school districts. Instead, these districts expect the Federal government to provide the additional funds required to maintain existing per-pupil funding levels.

Costs to the Federal government. Impact Aid funding is the vehicle the Federal government uses to reimburse local school districts for the costs of educating military-connected students. If all 15 DDESS systems were transferred to local schools, the total amount of Impact Aid funding that would be required (at full funding levels) would be an estimated \$83 million.³⁴ The costs required to bring the current DDESS facilities to an acceptable level of repair (another LEA requirement) can also be estimated. Based on the findings of a joint study sponsored by DoD and the U.S. Department of Education, the cost to correct maintenance and construction backlogs at the 58 DDESS facilities would be an estimated \$118 million.³⁵ Thus, the initial costs to the Federal government of a transfer of all DDESS students to the public school system would be at least \$201 million, with an estimated \$83 million in continuing annual Impact Aid costs. (In comparison, the total annual operating budget for these DDESS schools is about \$198 million.)

These transfer cost estimates address only two potential Federal costs (Impact Aid and initial capital improvements). Additional costs are likely to arise from: the long-term costs of maintaining, improving, or renovating DDESS facilities; up-front transition costs paid to LEAs to hire additional staff; and personnel costs associated with downsizing the DDESS staff and/or transitioning the DDESS staff to the LEA workforce. These costs are more variable and difficult to estimate, as they would have to be negotiated on a site-by-site basis.

³³ The states do not provide, and would not consider providing, local school districts with additional funding (beyond the usual state allocation) to compensate the districts for the cost of educating military-connected students.

³⁴ At the Fiscal Year 1995 Impact Aid funding level (which was 53% of full entitlement), the required funding amount would be about \$44 million. These estimates were calculated using current Impact Aid payment calculation procedures outlined in P.L. 103-382. These procedures are summarized in Appendix F, Table F.9 of this report. Payment calculations for the 15 DDESS sites are listed in Appendix F, Table F.10. Payment estimates have not been adjusted for inflation.

³⁵ This estimate is based on the joint report, *Construction, Repair, and Rehabilitation Needs of Dependent School Facilities Located on Military Installations in the United States* (March, 1995). At the time of that study, there were 71 DDESS facilities requiring an estimated \$144 million to correct maintenance and construction backlogs. The \$118 million estimate cited above is based on the pro-rata cost for 58 of the 71 facilities. This cost estimate has not been adjusted for inflation.

Site-specific Transfer Issues

The issues listed above apply to all 15 DDESS sites being considered for transfer. Additional transfer issues are relevant at some sites, but not at others. This section reviews these site-specific transfer issues.

Maintenance of and access to facilities. Some LEA officials were concerned about the future costs of maintaining the DDESS facilities if they were to own these facilities. This concern stemmed from their belief (based on their experience with funding) that the anticipated Federal Impact Aid funding that would accompany the DDESS students would fall considerably short of long-term maintenance or capital improvement costs. As a result, many LEA officials are hesitant to enter into any facility-ownership arrangement without some guarantee of adequate funding. On the other hand, LEA superintendents were often wary of *not* owning DDESS facilities since past experience at other installations has led them to believe that the Federal government cannot be counted on to maintain school facilities adequately.

Some installation commanders had reservations about turning over control of facilities located on their military installations. This issue is particularly salient at military installations with high security requirements. For example, one of the two elementary schools on Robins AFB is located in a sensitive area. Camp Lejeune, Dahlgren, and Pope AFB (served by the Fort Bragg DDESS system) are also considered limited access facilities. At Robins, Dahlgren, and Pope, installation commanders were unwilling to grant the LEAs access to the on-base DDESS facilities.

Student busing. At most sites, LEA superintendents reported that they would probably have to either bus on-base students to schools off the installation, or bus off-base students to schools on the installation. These moves were typically required by court-ordered integration decrees and/or to alleviate overcrowding in the local schools. The prospect of busing increases the concerns of installation and DDESS personnel and parents about student safety and the continued functioning of the on-base schools as neighborhood schools. Military parents were particularly upset by the prospect of having their children bused off the installation, into communities that they perceive to be (a) less safe environments for their children and (b) less receptive to or understanding of military personnel.

Jurisdictional conflicts. At five installations (Forts Benning, Campbell, Knox, McClellan, and Rucker), more than one local school district adjoins the installation and/or currently educates students affiliated with the installation. At each of these sites, DDESS and LEA personnel agreed that assignment of all DDESS students to one school district would be in the best interests of the students. Thus, in the event of a transfer, agreement would have to be reached over which school district would assume responsibility for the DDESS students at each of these five sites.

Jurisdictional issues are complicated at Fort Benning, Fort Campbell, and Fort Knox because the DDESS facilities and military housing units are located in more than one county. At Fort Campbell, DDESS facilities and military housing areas are located in more than one *state*. Resolving these conflicts using the jurisdictional boundaries of the counties and states could be problematic since some LEAs would receive the bulk of the students but only a few facilities. Another complication exists at Fort Rucker and Fort McClellan, where the DDESS systems do not educate students in grades 7-12. At each of these installations, upper-grade students can attend any of three local school districts. Altering this arrangement through a transfer of DDESS students to one school district would probably create resentment both among both on-post parents and the local school districts that lose military student enrollments.

LEA funding required for transfer. Many LEA officials were skeptical that the Federal Impact Aid program would provide sufficient funds to offset the increased financial costs of educating DDESS

students. Most LEA and state representatives viewed the Federal Impact Aid program as unstable and underfunded. To mitigate this funding problem, some LEA officials would make a transfer contingent on the provision of funding in addition to Impact Aid. Many LEA superintendents also stated that additional “transition” funds would have to be provided to allow the LEA to prepare for the rapid increase in its student population.

The Individual DDESS Systems

This section places the previously discussed site-specific transfer issues in context. The section summarizes, for each of the 15 DDESS sites, the most salient transfer issues raised at that site. The generic transfer issues that apply to all 15 sites are not included in these summaries. Instead, the summaries focus on the unique factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer at each site. As part of this summary, Table 5.4 presents site-specific background information—enrollments, numbers of schools, and grade ranges—for both the DDESS systems and the local school district(s) that would be considered to receive students in a transfer. The reader can refer to this table to obtain more information on the size and structure of the education systems at each DDESS site. DDESS sites are listed in the table and in the following text alphabetically, first by state and then within state.

Fort McClellan, Alabama

Fort McClellan is an open Army training post located in Calhoun County, Alabama. The installation is in a rural area, with Anniston and Jacksonville being the nearest towns. Fort McClellan includes 2,300 active-duty personnel and 3,700 family members. The installation has one DDESS school enrolling 383 students in kindergarten through grade 6. On-post students in grades 7-12 have the option of attending public school in one of three LEAs—Calhoun County, Anniston City, or Jacksonville City.

As previously mentioned, Fort McClellan is slated for closure in 1999. Thus, there is no reason to consider a transfer at this site since the on-post school will close along with the installation. Nonetheless, Fort McClellan transfer issues are presented here (both for the sake of completeness and in case the installation closure should be delayed or canceled.)

A transfer of the DDESS system at this installation would be made easier by the relatively small number of students to be transferred and by the LEAs’ experience educating older on-post students. In addition, access to the on-post facilities should not be an issue since the installation is open.

The major hindrance to a transfer at Fort McClellan is likely to be jurisdictional conflicts. A decision would have to be reached as to which of the three LEAs currently educating the older on-post students should receive the DDESS students. Although the Calhoun County LEA technically has jurisdiction over the installation, this LEA is willing to forego any claim to educating on-post students. Both city LEAs would, however, want the students. Further complicating this decision is the current arrangement that allows grade 7-12 students to attend any of the three LEAs. Ending this arrangement may add to military parents’ feeling that a transfer is eliminating their control over their children’s education. Transferring all on-post students to one LEA also could harm relations between the non-recipient communities and the post.

Table 5.4.
Summary Statistics on the 15 DDESS Systems and Their Adjacent LEAs

Installation/LEA	DDESS System			Local educational agency (or Agencies)						
	Grades	Number of schools	Enrollment	Grades	Number of schools	Total Enrollment	Number of on-base students	Number of military students	Current percent military students	Transfer percent military students
Ft. McClellan Calhoun Co. Anniston City Jacksonville City	K-6	1	383	K-12 K-12 K-12	15 11 2	10,270 3,872 1,516	51 57 56	782 359 278	8 9 18	11 17 35
Ft. Rucker Enterprise Daleville Ozark Dale County Coffee County	PK-6	2	1,102	K-12 K-12 K-12 K-12 K-12	10 3 6 7 6	5,130 1,495 3,270 2,458 1,741	146 159 67 0 0	1,099 386 387 40 33	21 26 12 2 2	35 57 34 32 40
Maxwell AFB Montgomery Co.	K-6	1	450	K-12	51	35,065	448	1,903	5	7
Ft. Benning Muscogee Co. Chattahoochee Co	K-8	7	3,164	K-12 K-8	54 1	29,677 461	540 0	3,604 27	12 6	21 88
Fort Stewart Liberty County	K-6	2	1,663	K-12	11	8,634	554	3,353	39	49
Robins AFB Houston Co.	K-6	2	890	K-12	26	15,883	386	1,435	9	14
Ft. Campbell Christian Co. Montgomery Co.	PK-12	7	4,297	K-12 K-12	17 23	9,429 17,442	0 13	1,001 4,370	11 25	39 40
Ft. Knox Hardin Co. Meade Co.	PK-12	9	3,677	K-12 K-12	20 9	12,037 3,719	0 0	1,981 272	16 7	36 53
West Point Highland Falls	K-8	1	725	K-12	3	1,060	165	165	16	50
Camp Lejeune Onslow Co.	K-12	8	3,505	K-12	28	17,347	14	5,990	35	46
Ft. Bragg Cumberland Co.	K-9	8	4,719	K-12	72	44,672	457	13,161	29	36
Ft. Jackson Richland Co. #2	PK-6	3	1,034	K-12	13	12,491	363	1,312	11	17
Laurel Bay MCB Beaufort Co.	PK-6	2	1,285	PK-12	19	12,714	258	1,180	9	18
Dahlgren NSWC King George Co.	PK-8	1	158	PK-12	4	2,351	28	79	3	9
Quantico MCB Prince William Co.	PK-12	5	1,301	K-12	67	42,532	35	6,021	14	17
Total		59	28,353		478	295,266	3,797	49,218	17	24

Source: U. S. Department of Education, *Impact Aid Program, Section 3 Recipient Districts* (Report DHSC8772), March 11, 1996; DoD DDESS Directory, School Year 1995-1996

Fort Rucker, Alabama

Fort Rucker is an open Army training post located in rural Alabama. The installation borders Dale and Coffee Counties and is surrounded by the towns of Enterprise, Daleville, and Ozark. Fort Rucker has 6,030 active-duty personnel and 8,400 family members. The Fort Rucker DDESS system consists of two schools educating 1,102 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 6.

Fort Rucker's on-post housing and DDESS facilities lie within the jurisdictional boundaries of Dale County. Coffee County also borders the installation but has no jurisdictional authority over the on-post housing or DDESS facilities. The schools in these two counties are located farther from the installation than are schools in the three neighboring city LEAs (Enterprise, Daleville, and Ozark). As a result, on-post students in grades 7-12 have the choice of attending public school in one of the three city LEAs. In the event of a transfer, all five LEAs would be willing to assume responsibility for the DDESS students, although the two county LEAs believe their schools are located too far from the installation to make a transfer feasible.

A transfer at this site would be facilitated by Fort Rucker's open access, and the fact that three of the LEAs already educate the installation's grade 7-12 students.

The major impediment to a transfer at this site is likely to be jurisdictional conflicts. Since the two county LEAs are both willing to forego any claim to the on-post students, a jurisdictional decision would most likely have to be made among the three city LEAs. A transfer would also probably end the current practice of allowing grade 7-12 students to attend school in any of the three city LEAs. Ending this practice could harm relations between the non-recipient communities and the post and would upset military parents with grade 7-12 children currently attending school in the non-recipient LEAs. All five LEAs are also under desegregation court orders, which may require busing of students onto or off the installation. This busing would jeopardize the functioning of these DDESS schools as neighborhood schools. Finally, all candidate LEAs would require additional up-front transition funding, adding to the costs and complexity of a transfer.

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Maxwell AFB is a secure installation located in Montgomery County, Alabama, near the state capital of Montgomery. The installation's main mission is training; it houses the Air Force's largest complex of professional training schools. Maxwell has 5,404 active-duty personnel and 7,500 family members. The base has one DDESS school educating 450 students in kindergarten through grade 6. On-base students in grades 7-12 attend public school in the Montgomery County LEA, a large school district serving both the city and county of Montgomery.

A transfer at this site would be facilitated by (a) the lack of jurisdictional conflict, (b) the LEA's experience educating the older on-base military children, and (c) the large size of the LEA relative to the small number of DDESS students. Although access to Maxwell AFB is restricted, the current DDESS facility is located on the perimeter of the installation; this school facility could be easily separated from the installation or otherwise made accessible to the LEA without compromising the installation's security.

A transfer would be complicated by two main factors. First, Montgomery County's court-ordered desegregation plan would most likely result in the busing of on-base students to schools elsewhere in the county, an action that DDESS parents oppose. Second, the LEA's funding is such that it cannot absorb additional students without funds in excess of what is anticipated under the current Impact Aid program.

The LEA's relatively low levels of funding and community support also are likely to add to on-base personnel's resistance to a transfer.

Fort Benning, Georgia

Fort Benning is an Army training base with 19,615 active-duty personnel and 21,705 family members. The post covers land in two Georgia counties: Muscogee and Chattahoochee. Off-post personnel and activities are primarily located in Muscogee County. Chattahoochee County is a predominantly rural county with only one school. This one school enrolls students in kindergarten through grade 8; older students attend school in Muscogee County. Fort Benning has seven DDESS schools that educate 3,164 students in kindergarten through grade 8. On-post students in grades 9-12 attend public school in Muscogee County.

A transfer at this site is made easier by the following factors. First, Muscogee County is a large LEA with the administrative capacity to absorb the DDESS students. Second, Muscogee County has experience educating on-post military children. Third, access issues are minimal since Fort Benning is an open post.

The main obstacle to a transfer at this site would most likely be the resolution of jurisdictional control. The counties' boundaries are not useful for determining jurisdiction because they divide the on-base housing and the DDESS facilities unevenly. Although Muscogee County appears the more logical choice for a transfer, Chattahoochee County does not support that assumption. Chattahoochee County fears that a transfer of the DDESS schools to Muscogee County could instigate the absorption of the smaller LEA *and* its county by the larger. A transfer of DDESS schools to Muscogee County could thus harm relations between the installation and its neighboring communities. The number of DDESS students that would be involved (over 3,000) would also add to the complexity of a transfer.

Fort Stewart, Georgia

Fort Stewart is an open Army installation located in a rural area in Liberty County, Georgia. The installation houses numerous units that are elements of the Rapid Deployment Force. Fort Stewart has 16,106 active-duty personnel and 24,397 family members. The DDESS system consists of two schools serving 1,663 students in kindergarten through grade 6. On-post students in grades 7-12 attend public school in Liberty County.

A transfer at this site should be facilitated by only one LEA (Liberty County) having jurisdictional claims on the DDESS students. LEA access to the DDESS students and facilities also should be easily arranged. In addition, Liberty County already has experience educating the older on-post students.

Issues concerning student busing and funding are likely to complicate a transfer at this site. The Liberty County LEA is overcrowded and under a desegregation court order. To alleviate overcrowding, the LEA may need to bus off-post students to on-post schools. To meet desegregation requirements, the LEA also may need to bus on-post students to schools off the installation. Neither scenario is viewed positively by on-post personnel. The LEA also does not perceive Impact Aid funding to be adequate to cover its costs during or after a transfer. The LEA would want additional funds to cover (a) on-going costs of educating DDESS students, (b) costs of maintaining and providing capital improvements to the on-post facilities, and (c) "up-front" costs of the initial transition.

Robins AFB, Georgia

Robins AFB is a restricted-access base located in Houston County in rural Georgia. The installation houses the Air Logistics Center and includes 4,760 active-duty personnel and 6,404 family members. The DDESS system consists of two schools educating 890 students in kindergarten through grade 6. On-base students in grades 7-12 attend public schools in the Houston County LEA. This LEA is a large school district with an increasing enrollment and much overcrowding.

A transfer at this site would not involve jurisdictional disputes since there is only one LEA eligible to receive the DDESS students. In addition, the Houston County LEA is large and could absorb the DDESS students relatively easily—as long as the on-base facilities were provided. Houston County could also take advantage of its experience educating the older on-post students. Finally, the county already has access to the base to bus students to LEA schools.

A transfer would be complicated by several issues. First, although the LEA has access to the base to bus older students, it would need access to the DDESS facilities if the younger on-post students were transferred. Access to these facilities may be difficult to arrange since one DDESS school is in a controlled access area, and the second is in an area that may soon become restricted. Also, on-base personnel oppose having students bused onto the installation, which might be required to alleviate overcrowding in current LEA schools. Finally, the Houston County LEA would require funding in addition to that anticipated under the current Impact Aid program; this funding would be needed to cover the long-term costs of educating on-base students and the initial costs of a transfer.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky

Fort Campbell houses the Army's 101st Airborne Division. The installation includes 22,859 active-duty personnel and 38,251 family members. Fort Campbell is a restricted-access post, occupying land in four counties: Christian and Trigg counties in Kentucky, and Montgomery and Stewart counties in Tennessee. All on-post housing and DDESS facilities are located in Christian County and Montgomery County. The base is economically and socially oriented toward the nearest town—Clarksville, in Montgomery County, Tennessee.

The Fort Campbell DDESS system consists of seven schools educating 4,297 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Five of these schools are located in Kentucky and two in Tennessee. However, all on-post schools are administered as if they were located in Kentucky. Only the off-post students attend public school in the local LEAs; most of these military-connected students live in and attend school in Montgomery County.

A transfer of the Fort Campbell DDESS system is made easier by the fact that both LEAs that have jurisdiction over the on-post students are willing to educate the students in their current DDESS facilities, minimizing concerns about busing or the loss of neighborhood schools.

Impediments to a transfer at this site include the following. First, a decision would have to be reached as to which of the two eligible LEAs would receive the DDESS students. Division along jurisdictional boundaries would have the disadvantage of placing the installation students in two separate states. This division would also create facilities problems since the installation housing and DDESS facilities do not divide equally along state lines. Access to DDESS facilities may be difficult to negotiate, since Fort Campbell is a secure installation and has no history of providing LEA access to either on-post students or facilities. The size of the Fort Campbell DDESS system (over 4,000 students) also would make a transfer more difficult, even for the relatively large LEAs around this installation. Finally, funding

negotiations may be complicated by both LEAs' requirement for more reliable and sufficient funding than is currently provided by the Impact Aid program.

Fort Knox, Kentucky

Fort Knox is one of the Army's major training installations. It is an open post, located in rural north-central Kentucky. Most of the installation is located in Hardin County, with the rest in Meade County. The Fort Knox population includes 8,615 active-duty personnel and 10,000 family members. The DDESS system consists of nine schools educating 3,677 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The two LEAs that would have jurisdiction over education of the on-post students are the Hardin County and Meade County LEAs. Hardin County currently educates most of the Fort Knox-affiliated students who live off-post.

A transfer of the Fort Knox DDESS system to local control would be facilitated by the fact that the smaller of the two LEAs that has jurisdictional authority over the installation (Meade County) is willing to forego that jurisdictional claim. In addition, access and security issues should be minimal since Fort Knox is an open post.

Fort Knox leaders, however, are reluctant to relinquish control of the large number of on-post DDESS facilities. In addition, although the Hardin County LEA is relatively large (about 12,000 students), a transfer of the 3,677 on-post students to that LEA would represent a sizable enrollment increase. The LEA is already overcrowded and thus anticipates that student busing would be required to alleviate overcrowding. On-post parents are opposed to having students bused either on or off the installation. The Hardin County LEA also does not believe that Impact Aid funds would be sufficient to cover the costs of educating the current DDESS students. The LEA would want additional funding and a guarantee that funding would remain at adequate levels.

West Point (United States Military Academy), New York

West Point is located in rural New York state. The installation supports over 6,000 faculty members and cadets, as well as 3,419 family members. All military members assigned to West Point must live on the Academy (or at a nearby Army subpost). West Point is an open installation with one DDESS school serving 725 students in kindergarten through grade 8. On-post students in grades 9-12 attend public schools in the nearby Highland Falls LEA. Unlike all other DDESS sites, the Highland Falls LEA is reimbursed for the education of on-post students through an annual contract arrangement, rather than through Impact Aid funding.

A transfer at this site would be facilitated by a number of factors: (a) there is only one LEA for transfer consideration and thus no jurisdictional conflicts; (b) security concerns would be minimal since West Point is an open post; (c) elementary students could remain in their current school facilities, alleviating parent concerns about busing; and (d) the Highland Falls LEA has experience educating on-post grade 9-12 students.

Other factors would impede a transfer. First, West Point does not lie within the jurisdictional boundary of the Highland Falls LEA, and New York state law prohibits LEAs from crossing jurisdictional lines to educate students; special arrangements would be needed to permit Highland Falls to educate students on-post. Second, Highland Falls would insist on additional funding through a contract arrangement. Third, the LEA may want to bus the on-post grade 7-8 students off the installation, a move that parents would oppose.

Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

Camp Lejeune is a Marine Corps installation located in rural North Carolina, along the Onslow County coastline. The installation is a major training site, as well as home to important elements of the Marine Corps' Atlantic Forces. Camp Lejeune is a closed installation, supporting 41,110 active-duty personnel and 57,000 family members. The DDESS system has eight schools educating 3,505 students in kindergarten through grade 12. Children affiliated with Camp Lejeune who live off the installation attend Onslow County public schools.

Two factors would facilitate a transfer at this site. First, there is only one LEA for transfer consideration (Onslow County). Second, Onslow County would not bus on-base students to schools off the installation; therefore, on-base students could continue to attend neighborhood schools.

A number of factors could impede a transfer. The Onslow County LEA is overcrowded and cannot keep up with current facilities needs. Thus, the LEA will probably need to bus students onto the base to alleviate overcrowding. Additional funding would also be required for continued facilities maintenance and renovation. In addition, the Onslow County LEA would require up-front transition funding as well as Impact Aid funding. Personnel issues are complicated by the fact that Camp Lejeune DDESS personnel are unionized, but the state of North Carolina does not allow collective bargaining for state employees, including public school employees. The large size of this DDESS system also makes a transfer more difficult. Finally, access to the on-base DDESS facilities also may be difficult to negotiate.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina

Fort Bragg is an Army installation located near Fayetteville, North Carolina. The population at Fort Bragg includes about 39,000 active-duty personnel and 75,000 family members. Adjoining Fort Bragg is Pope AFB. These installations cover land in many counties, but their main facilities are located in Cumberland County. Fort Bragg is an open installation; Pope AFB is closed. The Fort Bragg DDESS system serves school-aged children from both installations. This system includes eight schools (one located on Pope AFB) enrolling 4,719 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 9. On-base students in grades 10-12 attend public schools in Cumberland County, an LEA serving over 44,000 students.

Facilitating a transfer at this site is the fact that there is only one LEA, Cumberland County, with jurisdictional authority over installation students. In addition, this LEA can take advantage of the experience it currently has educating military students from both on and off the Fort Bragg-Pope AFB complex. Cumberland County also would try to keep the current DDESS schools as neighborhood schools for the on-base students. Finally, security concerns at Fort Bragg would be minimal since that installation is open.

Complicating a potential transfer is the tightly controlled access to Pope AFB. The base commander is not willing to give the LEA access to the DDESS school on that installation. Overcrowding in the LEA, however, would require the LEA either to use the existing DDESS facility or to construct a new facility. Cumberland County's overcrowding also means that the LEA might need to bus off-post students onto the installation. In addition, funding issues would have to be resolved. The LEA wants additional money (beyond Impact Aid) to cover the initial transition, continued school operation, and capital outlays. Finally, even though the Onslow County LEA is quite large, the large size of the Fort Bragg DDESS system would add to the difficulty of a transfer.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina

Fort Jackson is an Army installation located in Richland County, near Columbia, South Carolina. The installation is an open post, with a population of 8,525 active-duty personnel and 3,178 family members. The Fort Jackson DDESS system consists of three schools enrolling 1,034 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 6. On-post students in grades 7-12 attend public school in the Richland County Two LEA.

A transfer at this site would be facilitated by the absence of conflicts over jurisdiction or on-post access. In addition, the Richland Two LEA would attempt to keep the current DDESS schools as neighborhood schools for on-post elementary students.

Two issues that concern on-post parents could hinder a transfer at this site. First, the DDESS schools' integration with the on-post child development center may not be maintained by the LEA. Second, the LEA might bus students from off the installation to the on-post schools in order to alleviate overcrowding. Another potential impediment to transfer is funding. The Richland Two LEA would require funds in addition to Impact Aid to cover the costs of the initial transfer, the continued operation of the schools, and capital outlays.

Laurel Bay MCB, South Carolina

Laurel Bay MCB is located in Beaufort County, along a formerly rural coastline with a growing tourist industry. Laurel Bay is a 1,100-unit military housing area serving three installations in the area around Beaufort, South Carolina: Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort Naval Hospital, and Parris Island Marine Corps Recruit Depot. Although on-base housing is available at each of these installations, the Laurel Bay housing area contains the majority of military housing available in the area.

The Laurel Bay DDESS system educates children living in the Laurel Bay MCB housing area and children who live on the three installations served by Laurel Bay. This DDESS system consists of two schools (located on Laurel Bay) educating 1,285 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 6. Installation students in grades 7-12 attend public school in the Beaufort County LEA.

Two factors facilitate a transfer at this site. First, since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflicts should arise. Second, although Laurel Bay and most of the installations served by the Laurel Bay DDESS system are closed installations, Beaufort County already has access to these installations to transport students in grades 7-12. In addition, the Laurel Bay commander was willing to negotiate access to the on-base school facilities. Resolution of this issue could be very simple for one of Laurel Bay's two DDESS schools; this school is located near the installation's perimeter and could be separated from the installation by moving the perimeter boundary.

Student busing and funding would require resolution. Military parents do not want their children bused to off-base schools, but the LEA reserves the right to bus students either onto or off the installations in order to alleviate overcrowding in the LEA (and possibly to meet desegregation orders). Another complication is the LEA's request for funding in addition to Impact Aid. Additional funding is desired to cover the costs of the initial transfer and the continued costs of educating the current DDESS students.

Dahlgren NSWC, Virginia

Dahlgren is a restricted-access Naval installation located in King George County, a fast-growing county 50 miles south of Washington, DC. The installation's mission is weapons-system research and

development. The population at Dahlgren includes 700 active-duty personnel and 1,300 family members. Dahlgren has one DDESS school serving 158 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 8. Enrollment is expected to increase to around 300 as new housing units are completed. On-base students in grades 9-12 attend public school in the King George County LEA.

A transfer at this site would be facilitated by the fact that there is only one LEA with jurisdictional authority over the DDESS students. Also, although Dahlgren is a closed installation, King George County already has access to the installation to bus grade 7-12 students. If necessary, access to bus the younger students should be negotiable. Third, fewer than 200 students would be added to the LEA's enrollment.

The major hindrance to a transfer at this site is likely to be the LEA's severe overcrowding. The base commander will not turn the on-base DDESS school over to the LEA, but the overcrowded LEA cannot accept the DDESS students without the school facility. In fact, regardless of whether the school building is transferred, the LEA is unwilling to accept the on-base DDESS students for five years, at which time its current school construction projects will be completed. Funding issues will also require resolution. The King George County LEA does not consider Impact Aid funds sufficient reimbursement for the education of on-base students. It would require a more adequate and reliable funding source.

Quantico MCB, Virginia

Quantico is the headquarters for the Marine Corps Combat Development Center Command, and offers an extensive array of officer training. The installation is an open base located in Prince William and Stafford Counties, Virginia, about 30 miles south of Washington, DC. The installation includes 6,882 active-duty personnel and 4,320 family members. The Quantico DDESS system consists of five schools serving 1,301 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Both the DDESS schools and on-base housing units fall within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Prince William County LEA, a large and growing school district.

A number of factors would facilitate a transfer at this site. First, only one LEA has jurisdiction over the on-base students; thus, there should be no jurisdictional conflicts. Second, Prince William County is a very large LEA that could easily absorb the relatively small number of Quantico DDESS students. Third, since Quantico is an open base, granting the LEA access to the on-base facilities should not be an issue. Fourth, the LEA is willing to keep all on-base students up to grade 8 in their current facilities, preserving neighborhood schools for most current DDESS students.

Two factors could impede a potential transfer. First, grade 9-12 DDESS students would most likely be bused to a high school off the installation. Second, the King George County LEA wants a guarantee of a more reliable funding source than that currently provided by Impact Aid.

Summary

Survey findings for each of the 15 installations with DDESS schools support the overall findings on DDESS quality and transfer reviewed in earlier chapters. At each installation, over 80 percent of parents rated the overall quality of DDESS schools with an A or a B, and over 70 percent opposed a transfer of the DDESS schools to local public schools. In general, parent opposition to transfer was greater at installations where: (a) higher proportions of parents rated DDESS school quality higher than local school quality, (b) higher proportions of parents were concerned about other education-related transfer issues (student safety, needs of military students, neighborhood schools/busing, and links to base

services), (c) installation personnel consisted of higher proportions of officers, and (d) installation personnel included lower proportions of parents with public school experience.

All administrative personnel that would be involved in a potential transfer were overwhelmingly in favor of maintaining the status quo. State agencies typically conditioned their support for a transfer on the receipt of adequate Federal funding to compensate LEAs for their lack of tax revenues. The positions of the relevant LEAs were more complex. While all LEAs were willing to accept responsibility for these students, none actively favored a transfer. Yet if a transfer were to occur, LEAs that could potentially lose military-connected enrollments (to another recipient LEA) were often interested in assuming responsibility for the DDESS students. All LEA officials conditioned their acceptance of the current DDESS students on the receipt of adequate Federal funding and on ownership or use of the current DDESS facilities.

Installation personnel were typically the most strongly opposed to a transfer. Installation commanders were fearful that loss of the DDESS schools would be viewed as a degradation of current quality-of-life programs and that this loss could lead service members to avoid assignments at their installation (or to leave the military prematurely). DDESS personnel felt that a transfer would sacrifice education quality, attention to the needs of military children, student discipline and safety, and the advantages of the strong links between the DDESS schools and (a) other on-base services and (b) the installation chain-of-command. DDESS personnel also noted that issues concerning personnel pay, hiring and benefits would have to be resolved during transfer negotiations since DDESS staff tend to be better-paid and DDESS schools tend to be better staffed than their adjacent LEAs. Finally, DDESS officials noted that transfer negotiations should include representation of on-base parents on LEA school boards.

A number of additional site-specific logistical, administrative and legal issues would need to be addressed in a transfer. Many of these issues involve the DDESS facilities. While the eligible LEAs would require access to or ownership of the DDESS facilities, some installation commanders were reluctant to allow such accommodations. In addition, some states would require ownership of the DDESS facilities before any public funds could be expended on facilities maintenance or capital improvements. State and local officials also do not want to assume ownership of facilities that do not meet state building codes or that require major renovation. Some LEAs further stipulated that they would require Federal funding in addition to Impact Aid to provide for continued facilities maintenance and improvement.

At five installations, more than one local school district adjoins the installation and/or currently educates students affiliated with the installation. In the event of a transfer, agreement would have to be reached over which school district would assume responsibility for the DDESS students at each of these installations.

Finally, LEA officials were often skeptical that the Federal Impact Aid program would provide sufficient funds to offset the increased financial costs of educating DDESS students. These officials often desired to make a transfer contingent on the provision of funding in addition to Impact Aid. Many LEA superintendents also stated that additional “transition” funds would be required to allow the LEA to prepare for the increase in its student population.

In general, transfer initiatives that address the common parent concerns found in this study—parents’ perceptions of the relative quality of the DDESS versus LEA schools, and their concerns about other issues related to their children’s education—are likely to reduce parent opposition to a transfer. The support of states and LEAs seems to be most dependent on guarantees of reliable Federal funding that would fairly compensate LEAs for their additional costs. Beyond that, a number of administrative and logistical issues would remain to be addressed at each site. To be successful, any transfer initiative must consider which individual issues apply to each DDESS site, and address those issues in the context of that

particular site. Transfer arrangements appropriate for one location may not necessarily provide the best solution at another.

Chapter 6: Military Parents' Views on LEA School Quality

This chapter presents findings from the *LEA Survey*. This survey asked military parents their opinion on the quality of education in the 93 target LEAs in which over 30 percent of enrolled students are military-connected.³⁶ The first section of the chapter examines parents' general opinions regarding LEA schools. The second section looks at how parents evaluate DDESS educational programs (including overall school quality). These parent ratings are placed in the context of other parent ratings of school quality in the third section of the chapter. The chapter concludes with a summary of key findings.

As in Chapter 3, this chapter compares the responses of LEA parents in different paygrade groups and whose children attend school at different grade levels. Findings from the *LEA Survey* are also compared to relevant findings from the *DDESS Survey* and from the nationwide Gallup Poll on education (Elam & Rose, 1995).

Opinions about LEA Schools

LEA parents were asked several questions about general aspects of LEA schools. These questions can be divided into two categories: how much parents agreed with general characterizations of their child's school as well-run and effective, and how much input parents thought they had with regard to school decision-making.

General Characterizations of LEA Schools

To assess opinions on LEA school quality, parents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with 10 statements that characterize LEA schools as well-run, high quality schools.³⁷ Some statements focused on particular aspects of school quality (e.g., instructional quality), while others reflected aspects related to overall school quality (e.g., the reputation of the school). Table 6.1 presents parents' responses to these statements, listed in order from highest to lowest percentage of agreement.

In general, military parents agreed that these positive characteristics applied to the LEA schools attended by their children. Approximately 21 percent of parents agreed with all 10 statements. A majority of parents agreed with each statement, with agreement levels on items ranging from 52 percent to 78 percent. Parents who did not agree with a statement were more often inclined to be neutral (neither agree nor disagree) than to disagree with the statement.

Agreement levels were highest for the statements, "This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning" and "This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning." About three-quarters of the LEA parents agreed with these statements. These were the same statements that were agreed with most often by DDESS parents (although levels of agreement were higher for DDESS parents). Generating the least support among LEA parents was "This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students," with slightly over half of the parents (52%) expressing agreement and nearly a fifth (18%) expressing disagreement. As discussed in Chapter 3, the relatively low

³⁶ See Chapter 2 for details on how these LEAs were defined and identified.

³⁷ As discussed in Chapter 3 (footnote 18), this analysis excludes an eleventh item that asked parents whether they agreed with the statement, "This school is *not* underfunded."

rating for this item supports the view of DDESS site-visit participants, who felt that the DDESS schools are better at meeting these unique student needs.

Table 6.1.

LEA Parents' Level of Agreement with Positive Characterizations of the LEA School

Characterization of the LEA School	Percent Agreeing/Disagreeing with Each Statement ¹					
	Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning.	78	±1.0	13	±1.0	9	±0.8
This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning.	74	±0.8	12	±0.8	14	±0.8
The quality of instruction at this school is good.	71	±1.4	16	±1.2	13	±0.8
Students at this school are treated fairly, regardless of their race, sex, or social class.	70	±1.0	18	±0.8	12	±1.0
This school is providing my child with a good education.	70	±1.2	15	±1.0	15	±1.0
This school is well-equipped; students have the necessary books and materials, access to computers, science labs, etc.	65	±1.0	12	±1.0	23	±0.8
This school has a good reputation.	64	±1.4	23	±1.4	13	±0.8
This school's academic program is challenging and rigorous.	63	±1.4	19	±1.0	18	±1.2
This school provides additional help to students who have trouble learning.	58	±1.4	28	±1.2	13	±0.8
This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students.	52	±1.4	30	±1.4	18	±1.2

Source: *LEA Survey*, Question 1

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

¹The agree category includes parents who marked *agree* or *strongly agree*, and the disagree category includes parents who marked *disagree* or *strongly disagree*.

Parents' Voice in School Decisions

There is a growing body of research (e.g., National Center for Education Statistics, 1996; National Education Goals Panel, 1995) suggesting that parents' involvement in their child's schooling contributes to the quality of that schooling. The issue of parental involvement is particularly salient to military parents. Since they are transient "outsiders" in local communities, military parents' opportunities for participation in local school systems may be limited. Residency requirements, for example, often make them ineligible to vote or serve on local school boards.

Table 6.1 shows that 78% of military parents agreed that their child's LEA school encourages parent involvement. To further explore the issue of parental involvement, the *LEA Survey* asked military parents the following question: "To what extent do you feel that you have an adequate voice in decisions about the educational programs at your child's school?"³⁸ Responses to this question were not as positive. Only 20 percent ($CI=\pm 1.2$) of military parents felt that they had a large or very large voice in the school's

³⁸ Question 4 on the *LEA Survey*.

educational program. About one-third (35%, $CI=\pm 1.2$) reported that they had a moderate voice in these decisions, and slightly less than half (44%, $CI=\pm 1.4$) reported that they had no more than a small voice in school decision-making. This is a notably lower level of involvement than that reported by DDESS parents. For example, 47 percent of DDESS parents felt that they had at least a large voice in DDESS school decision-making, compared to only 20 percent of military LEA parents. Again, this difference supports site-visit participants' claims that they have more control over their children's education in DDESS schools rather than in public schools.

Parents' Evaluation of LEA Education Programs

The most direct approach used in the *LEA Survey* to measure school quality was to ask parents to grade LEA schools and school programs using the traditional A, B, C, D, and F grading system. These grade ratings were examined for all LEA parents and for parents in two subgroups—parents at different paygrade levels, and parents of students at different grade levels.

Overall Findings

Table 6.2 lists the grades that LEA parents provided. In this table, overall school quality is listed first; it is followed by specific programs listed according to the percentage of military parents who gave the program a grade of A or B.

Parents rated the programs provided by LEA schools positively. About two thirds of parents (62%-68%) rated overall school quality and each *academic* program with an A (*excellent*) or B (*good*). Roughly one fourth of parents (24%-29%) gave these programs a grade of C (*satisfactory*). Only 9 to 12 percent of LEA parents gave these programs a grade of D (*poor*) or F (*fail*).

Evaluations were highest for reading/English/language arts and mathematics programs; for these programs, 68 percent and 67 percent of parents, respectively, gave A or B ratings. Grades were lowest for support services. Just over half of the parents (56%) gave these services an A or B, and 16 percent gave them a D or F. As noted in Chapter 3, the rank-ordering of specific school programs was the same for DDESS, DoDDS, and LEA schools. This pattern of findings suggests that these schools have similar educational priorities.

Subgroup Analyses

Table 6.3 presents the (A or B) grades provided by LEA parents in different paygrade groups and for different school levels. LEA parents in the three paygrade groups generally did not differ in their grading of the LEA schools. Ratings did vary among parents whose children attended different school levels. Compared to parents of older children, parents of elementary school children were more likely to grade their child's school with either an A or a B. For example, two thirds (67%) of elementary school parents rated the overall quality of the LEA school with an A or a B, compared to just over half of middle school parents (55%) and high school parents (57%). As noted in Chapter 3 (where similar findings were found for DDESS school level), this finding may reflect differences in schools at different levels, or differences in parents' involvement or experience with the schools. (Other explanations are possible as well.)

Table 6.2.

LEA Parents' Ratings of Selected LEA Programs and of Overall School Quality

Program	Percent Assigning Grade to Each LEA Program											
	A Excellent		B Good		C Satisfactory		D Poor		F Fail		A or B	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Overall quality of the school	21	±1.2	42	±1.4	27	±1.0	8	±0.8	2	±0.4	63	±1.2
Reading/English/language arts program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	25	±1.2	43	±1.2	24	±1.2	7	±0.6	2	±0.2	68	±1.4
Mathematics program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	25	±1.4	43	±1.4	24	±1.4	7	±0.6	2	±0.4	67	±1.2
Special education programs (programs for disabled students)	25	±2.2	37	±2.4	26	±1.8	8	±1.2	4	±0.8	62	±2.0
Science program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	21	±1.4	41	±1.4	29	±1.2	8	±0.6	2	±0.4	62	±1.2
Overall academic program (e.g., variety of courses, challenging material)	20	±1.4	41	±1.4	28	±1.4	8	±0.8	2	±0.4	62	±1.2
Support services provided by the school (testing and screening, individual counseling, assistance with course selection, and college and career guidance)	20	±1.2	36	±1.8	28	±1.2	11	±0.8	5	±0.8	56	±1.6

Source: LEA Survey, Question 2

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.. "A" and "B" percentages may not sum to "A or B" percentage due to rounding.

Table 6.3.

LEA Parents' Ratings of Selected LEA Programs and of Overall School Quality, by Parent Group

Parent Group	Percent Assigning Grade of A or B to Program													
	Overall quality		Reading, English, & lang. arts		Math		Special education		Overall academics		Science		Support services	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
All Parents	63	±1.2	68	±1.4	67	±1.2	62	±2.0	62	±1.2	62	±1.2	56	±1.6
Paygrade Group														
Commissioned officers	64	±2.7	70	±2.4	68	±2.7	61	±4.5	63	±2.7	61	±2.9	55	±2.9
Senior enlisted & warrant officers	61	±2.7	66	±2.4	68	±2.2	59	±4.1	61	±2.5	62	±2.5	53	±2.7
Junior enlisted	64	±2.0	69	±2.0	67	±1.8	63	±2.7	62	±1.8	62	±2.2	58	±2.2
Level of School														
Elementary	67	±1.6	71	±1.4	69	±1.8	64	±2.4	65	±1.6	61	±1.8	60	±2.5
Middle	55	±4.3	63	±4.1	64	±4.3	57	±5.5	53	±3.5	61	±3.3	50	±4.3
High	57	±3.3	64	±2.9	63	±2.9	56	±4.1	60	±2.7	62	±3.1	47	±3.3

Source: LEA Survey, Questions 2 (grade ratings), 15 (paygrade), and 5 (school level)

LEA Parents' Quality Ratings in Perspective

As indicated above, the majority of military parents viewed the quality of education in their child's LEA school favorably. To put these ratings into a larger context, this section compares military parents' views on the overall quality of their child's LEA school to their view on the quality of schools in the U.S. as a whole. Ratings from *LEA Survey* parents are also compared to analogous ratings made by public school parents in the 1995 Gallup Poll on education. Table 6.4 lists these sets of parent ratings of overall school quality.

Table 6.4.
Parents' Ratings of Overall School Quality from Two Surveys

School/Survey	Percent Assigning Each Grade to School									
	A Excellent		B Good		C Satisfactory		D Poor		F Fail	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
LEA Survey										
Own child's school	21	±1.2	42	±1.4	27	±1.0	8	±0.8	2	±0.4
U.S. public schools	7	±0.8	31	±1.2	43	±1.2	16	±1.0	3	±0.6
1995 Gallup Poll¹										
Own child's school	27	*	38	*	23	*	8	*	3	*
U.S. public schools	2	*	18	*	54	*	21	*	5	*

Source: *LEA Survey*, Questions 2 (LEA school rating) and 3 (U.S. public school rating); *The 27th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools*.

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.

¹Responses are for parents with children in public schools, and for the oldest child that parent has in school. Ratings for U.S. public schools were adjusted to exclude the 13% who had responded "don't know."

*Approximate 95% confidence intervals for the Gallup Poll data are between ±4 and ±6 percentage points.

Two findings emerge from these data. First, LEA parents showed the same tendency, as discussed in Chapter 3, of rating their own child's school higher than they rate U.S. schools in general. Sixty-three percent of LEA parents rated their child's school with an A or a B, while only 38 percent of these parents rated U.S. public schools this high. As seen in Table 6.4, a similar pattern was found in the Gallup Poll³⁹ (65% versus 20% rating schools A or B). Chapter 3 showed that DDESS parents also followed this pattern.

Second, the more informative comparison of parents' ratings of their own children's schools shows LEA and Gallup Poll parents rated these schools similarly. For example, 65 percent of U.S. public school parents rated their own child's school with an A or a B, compared to 63 percent of LEA parents (a nonsignificant difference). Perceptions of military parents about school quality within these target LEAs were, therefore, very much in line with parental perceptions of public school quality in the nation as a whole.

³⁹ For the *DDESS Survey* and the *LEA Survey*, one could assume that parents rated their own child's school more highly than they rated U.S. public schools simply because the DDESS and target LEA schools *are* better than the average public school. This argument is less credible for the Gallup Poll data, however. The Gallup Poll surveyed a nationally representative sample of *adults*, which should differ very little from a nationally representative sample of public school *parents*. Thus, the ratings that public school parents in the Gallup Poll give to their child's public school are essentially equivalent to a rating of all public schools in the nation.

Summary

This chapter reviewed military parents' views on school quality, as derived from the *LEA Survey*. This survey asked about education quality in schools in the 93 LEAs that had 1994-95 enrollments that were at least 30 percent military-connected. In general, a majority of these military parents had favorable opinions about these LEA schools. About two thirds of LEA parents gave high grades (A or B) to LEAs' educational programs and to overall school quality. The grade ratings given to the LEA schools were very similar to those given by public school parents generally when rating their children's schools. These data indicate that parents perceive LEA school quality to be equivalent to that found in the nation's public schools as a whole.

Parents' ratings of specific programs and aspects of their child's LEA school were lower than those given to DDESS schools, but the two survey ratings followed similar patterns (i.e., rank-orderings). The one notable exception is that LEA parents rated LEA schools' responsiveness to the needs of military students much lower than did DDESS parents. From a military parents' point of view, this lack of responsiveness may have a significant effect on how the parent views the overall quality of the school.

The *LEA Survey* also showed that a substantial proportion of military parents did not feel they had an adequate voice in decisions in their children's LEA schools. About 44 percent felt they had no more than a limited voice in these decisions. In contrast, only 22 percent of DDESS parents felt they had no more than a limited voice in their child's school. What we cannot tell from these data is whether military parents in these LEAs have more or less input than do non-military parents in the same LEAs.

This chapter also examined the responses of LEA parents in three paygrade groups and whose children attended school at different grade levels. In general, commissioned officers, senior enlisted/warrant officers, and junior enlisted personnel did not differ in their opinions on school quality. Differences were found, however, among parents at different school levels. Compared to parents of middle and high school students, parents of elementary students were generally more positive about the quality of education received by their children in LEA schools. This finding is not unique to these LEA schools; it seems to reflect more general differences between elementary schools (and/or parents) and upper-level schools (and/or parents).

Chapter 7: Funding of Impact Aid LEAs

This chapter examines the Federal government's fiscal role in assisting LEAs that are affected by a Federal military presence. To address this issue, the chapter focuses on the following questions. First, whose responsibility is it to educate military-connected students, and what problems do states and localities face in assuming this responsibility? These questions are important because they determine the willingness of states and localities to contribute funding to the education of military-connected students, and they reveal funding needs that may be particular to the education of these students. Two other key questions are: How are the LEAs that educate large proportions of military-connected students funded, and how *well* are they funded? These questions directly address the Congressional request to examine sources and levels of funding among these school districts.

The chapter focuses on the 93 LEAs with enrollments that are over-30-percent military-connected (as discussed in Chapter 2). Chapter findings were derived primarily from interviews with state and local education officials and from funding data provided by the U.S. Department of Education. These findings are organized as follows. First, LEA and state views on the education of military-connected children are reviewed. The following section examines Impact Aid funding, focusing on the role of Federal Impact Aid in compensating LEAs for the reduced local contribution that results from their military-connected enrollments. The chapter then reviews LEAs' funding sources and levels, and ends with a summary of findings.

The Education of Military-connected Students

Responsibility for the education of military-connected children has shifted over the decades. The Federal government has accepted various levels of financial responsibility in response to (a) the inability of states or localities to assume responsibility for military-connected students and (b) localities' needs for funding when they took on this educational responsibility. This section reviews states' and localities' current positions on who they believe is responsible for the education of military-connected students, and the problems they face in providing a public education for these students. Findings for both sets of analyses were derived from the interviews of state and local education officials. Since only 93 LEAs and 34 states were part of this data collection, findings are typically presented as both percentages and LEA/state counts.

Responsibility for Educating Military-connected Students

State and local officials were asked who they thought is responsible for educating military-connected students. Separate questions were asked regarding the responsibility for educating military-connected students who reside (a) on a military installation and (b) off an installation (in the local community). Officials were also asked whether there was a legal or financial basis for their positions. Because the legislation mandating this study called for investigating only the responsibility for students who live *on* military installations, this section focuses on those students. The responsibility for students who live off installations is included to provide an additional context for interpreting findings.

It is important to note that regardless of opinions gathered from the state and local officials, there is significant legal authority (such as state constitutions and legal cases) for the proposition that states have a legal obligation to educate military connected children present within their boundaries.

Opinions of LEA officials. As shown in Table 7.1, 75 LEAs responded to the question concerning responsibility to educate military-connected students who reside *on* an installation.⁴⁰ Thirty-eight (51%) of these LEAs stated that it was their responsibility to educate these students. There was slightly more acceptance of LEA responsibility to educate military-connected students who reside *off* an installation. Forty-six (58%) of the 79 LEAs⁴¹ responding to the question regarding the education of military-connected students who reside *off* an installation stated that it was their responsibility to educate these students.

Table 7.1.

LEA Officials' Views Regarding Responsibility to Educate Military-connected Students

For Military Students Who Reside:	Number and Percent of LEA Officials Assigning Responsibility to:							
	Local Government		State Government		Federal Government		Shared Local/State/Federal	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
On an installation (<i>n</i> =75)	38	51	1	1	21	28	15	20
Off an installation (<i>n</i> =79)	46	58	1	1	17	22	15	19

Source: Impact Aid LEA Telephone Interview, Questions 18 and 19

LEA officials who did not accept the education of military-connected students as an LEA responsibility typically indicated that the education of these students was either the sole responsibility of the Federal government or the shared responsibility of the local, state, and Federal governments. Thirty-six LEAs (48%) stated that the education of *on-base* students was either a Federal government responsibility or a shared responsibility of the local, state, and Federal governments. Similarly, 32 LEAs (41%) stated that the education of *off-base* students was either a Federal government responsibility or a shared responsibility of the local, state, and Federal governments.

In sum, most (but not all) of these Impact Aid LEAs were willing to assume at least some responsibility for the education of military-connected students who reside on an installation (71% assumed this responsibility) or off an installation (77% assumed this responsibility). However, almost half of the LEAs also felt that the Federal government had some responsibility for the education of both groups of military-connected students (48% for on-base students, 41% for off-base students).

In response to the question on whether their opinions had a legal or financial basis, no LEA official was able to state a legal position supporting his or her view on the responsibility to educate military-connected students. All LEA arguments supporting the education of these students as the responsibility of the state or Federal government were financially based. Of those LEAs stating that the responsibility to educate military-connected students belonged at least in part to the Federal government, nearly all indicated that this responsibility could be met in the form of financial assistance.

⁴⁰ Of the 91 participating LEAs, 75 provided a position in regard to educating military-connected students residing on military installations. Fourteen LEAs replied that the question did not apply to them as they currently had no on-base military children attending their schools; the remaining two LEAs did not respond.

⁴¹ Of the 91 LEAs participating in the interview, 79 LEAs gave a position regarding the responsibility to educate military-connected students residing off military installations. Five LEAs replied that all their military-connected students reside on military installations; the remaining 7 LEAs gave no reply or stated that the issue was not applicable to them.

Opinions of state education officials. Table 7.2 provides the responses of state education officials to these questions about responsibility for the education of military-connected students. Of the 34 states participating in the interview, 29 provided a position in regard to educating military-connected students residing *on* military installations, and 32 provided a position on the responsibility to educate military-connected students residing *off* military installations.

State officials were more likely to view the education of military-connected students as an LEA or state responsibility than as a Federal responsibility. As was true for LEA officials, the education of on-base military-connected students was more likely to be seen as a Federal responsibility than was the education of off-base military-connected students.

Table 7.2.

State Education Officials' Views Regarding Responsibility to Educate Military-connected Students

For Military Students Who Reside:	Number and Percent of State Education Officials Assigning Responsibility to:							
	Local Government		State Government		Federal Government		Shared Local/State/Federal	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
On an installation (<i>n</i> =29)	8	28	10	34	6	21	5	17
Off an installation (<i>n</i> =32)	11	34	13	41	3	9	5	16

Source: Impact Aid State Telephone Interview, Questions 12 and 13

Of the 29 states replying to the question concerning the education of *on-base* students, 8 (28%) states said it was a local responsibility and 10 (34%) said it was a state responsibility. Thus, 18 states (62%) assumed only local or state roles for this responsibility. Conversely, 11 (38%) states assumed the Federal government bears at least some responsibility for the education of on-base students. Again, responsibility for the education of *off-base* students was more likely to be seen as a local or state responsibility than was the education of on-base students. Of the 32 states replying to this question, 24 (75%) said the education of off-base students was a local or state responsibility, and 8 (25%) said it was at least partially a Federal responsibility.

State officials gave the same rationale for their opinions on educational responsibility as did LEA officials. None of the state officials stated that their views were supported by any legal position. All state-level arguments supporting the education of military-connected students as the responsibility of the Federal government were financially based.

Agreement between state and LEA officials. Since LEAs are not distributed evenly across the 34 states, comparing the views of states and LEAs independently can result in misleading conclusions. These comparisons are more validly made with states and LEAs matched. Therefore, this section tabulates an LEA's position against *its state's* position. Table 7.3 provides data comparing LEA positions on the responsibility to educate military-connected students who reside *on* military installations with the position of their respective states. These data are based on the responses of the 69 LEAs for which a state position was also available. Table 7.4 provides analogous data for the responsibility to educate students residing *off* an installation, using data from the 74 LEAs for which LEA and state responses were available.

Table 7.3.

The Position of LEAs and Their States on Responsibility to Educate On-Base Students

Position of the LEA's State	Number of LEA Officials Assigning Responsibility to:			
	Local Government	State Government	Federal Government	Shared Local/State/Federal
Local Government	11	0	3	0
State Government	14	1	9	14
Federal Government	9	0	1	0
Shared LEA/State/Federal	3	0	3	1
Total Number of LEAs	37	1	16	15

Source: Impact Aid LEA Interview, Question 18; State Telephone Interview, Question 12

Table 7.4.

The Position of LEAs and Their States on Responsibility to Educate Off-Base Students

Position of the LEA's State	Number of LEA Officials Assigning Responsibility to:			
	Local Government	State Government	Federal Government	Shared Local/State/Federal
Local Government	15	0	6	2
State Government	20	1	7	10
Federal Government	8	0	0	1
Shared LEA/State/Federal	1	0	2	1
Total Number of LEAs	44	1	15	14

Source: Impact Aid LEA Interview, Question 19; Impact Aid State Telephone Interview, Question 13

In both cases, LEAs and their states typically disagreed on who is responsible for educating military-connected students. For example, among the 69 LEAs with both LEA and state positions on the education of *on-base* students, there were only 14 (20%) LEAs for which the LEA and its respective state agreed on who is responsible for the education of these students. Thus, 55 (80%) LEAs disagreed with their states on who has responsibility. Similarly, among the 74 LEAs with LEA and state data concerning the education of *off-base* students, only 17 (23%) LEAs agreed with their states on this issue, while 57 (77%) disagreed.

Examining LEAs' and states' disagreements more closely shows that localities and states each accepted more responsibility for the education of military-connected students than their counterparts assumed they should. That is, localities were more likely than their states to assign the responsibility for educating military-connected students to the local government, while states were more likely than their LEAs to assign this responsibility to the state. LEAs were also more likely than their states to assign responsibility for the education of military-connected students to the Federal government (alone or in combination with the state and local governments). For example, among the 37 LEAs that assigned responsibility for the education of *on-base* students to the local government, only 11 were in states that also gave this responsibility to localities, and 14 were in states that gave this responsibility to the state government. Only one LEA assigned this responsibility to the state, although 38 LEAs were in states that assumed this responsibility for themselves. Finally, 38 LEAs stated that the education of on-base students was a responsibility of the Federal government or a joint responsibility of all three levels of government,

but only 17 LEAs were in states that took this position. (The same pattern was found for the responsibility to educate *off-base* students.)

It thus appears that states and localities view the issue of responsibility for educating military-connected students somewhat differently. Both seem to feel more responsibility for this task than does the other, possibly because each sees its own agency as providing funds for the education of these students. Response bias also may account for part of this difference; personnel at the local and state levels may each have felt some obligation to assume this responsibility when asked by a representative of the Federal government.

Nonetheless, in terms of the Federal role, the bottom line remains as follows. In 43 of 69 LEAs (62%), either the LEA or its state agency viewed the Federal government as at least partially responsible for the education of military-connected students who reside *on* an installation. More specifically, in 26 (38%) LEAs, both local and state education agencies viewed the education of on-base students as exclusively a local and/or state responsibility. In 38 (55%) LEAs, the local and state agencies disagreed about whether the Federal government has any responsibility, and in five (7%) LEAs, the local and state agencies agreed that the Federal government has at least partial responsibility for the education of these students.

Problems Faced in Educating Military-connected Students

In general, LEA and state officials noted that they attempt to provide the best education programs possible to all children within their jurisdictional boundaries, regardless of whether or not the student has a military connection. Nearly all LEA officials, however, expressed some dissatisfaction with their current funding levels, and typically described their overall funding outlook as bleak. These officials cited increasing difficulty in their ability to get local citizens to approve tax increases to support school budget increases. This problem appears to be particularly challenging in those localities where (a) budget increases have been caused predominately by increases in military-connected enrollments and (b) a large proportion of these students' parents are not subject to the tax increases. LEA officials also were often dissatisfied with current levels of Impact Aid funding.

It is thus not surprising that when state and LEA officials were asked specifically what problems they face associated with educating military-connected students, funding problems were the most commonly mentioned. Of the 87 LEAs that responded to this question, only 12 (14%) stated that they had no problems associated with the education of military-connected students.⁴² All of the remaining 75 LEAs indicated that their problems educating military-connected students were funding related.⁴³ Many of these LEAs expressed only a general concern regarding their obligation to educate a large number of students for whom they received an insufficient contribution to their local education budget. Additional specific comments from other LEAs follow.

⁴² These 12 LEAs were not discernibly different from the other 75 LEAs (e.g., there were no apparent geographical patterns).

⁴³ The question asking about problems in educating military-connected students was (like all other interview questions) open-ended. Responses to this question also were not externally constrained (as were, for example, responses to the question of who is responsible for educating military-connected students). Therefore, the discussion of responses to this question focuses on general patterns of responses rather than actual numbers and percentages. The report would convey a false sense of precision by presenting more specific figures in response to such a general question.

Many LEAs stated that the major problem they experienced in educating military-connected students was the transience of these students. Respondents noted that because of the frequency with which military-connected students enter their schools, these schools have a greater-than-average need for diagnostic testing and counseling services. These services are necessary to ensure that military-connected students (as well as other newly entering students) are placed in the appropriate grade and/or course levels. Officials noted that funds were insufficient to allow for the provision of these services at the requisite levels. Large student fluctuations caused by military base realignments and closures were also mentioned as a difficulty by a few LEAs.

Some LEA officials mentioned funding difficulties related to staffing and construction planning. These problems were partially attributed to fluctuations in student enrollments associated with military base realignments and closures. For example, additional facilities were sometimes built or renovated at considerable expense to accommodate an anticipated increase in military-connected students, only to find that such increases did not occur.

Finally, some LEAs indicated that they had difficulty funding the special education programs needed by military-connected students. Respondents stated that although they received additional Impact Aid funding for special education students, this funding was insufficient to meet the needs of these disabled students.

Impact Aid Funding

As discussed in more detail in Chapter 1, local revenues to support education typically come from taxation on two types of property: (a) the property of private individuals; and (b) real or personal property used for business purposes. Providing for the education of military-connected students can adversely affect an LEA's budget because the school district has no taxing authority over the Federal property on which military students reside or on most personal property owned by military service members. Although state funding allocations to LEAs typically include these military-connected students, LEAs have no (or only a diminished) source of local revenues for the education of these children. These LEAs rely on Federal Impact Aid to offset shortfalls in their local contribution to per-pupil expenditures (PPEs) resulting from the education of military-connected students.

State and local education officials' concerns about Impact Aid can be categorized into three related areas. One concern involves the reliability and timing of Impact Aid funds. A second concern is the level of Impact Aid funding that is provided. Education officials' third concern is the need for DoD funding to supplement Impact Aid. Each of these topics is reviewed separately in the next three sub-sections.

Reliability and Timing of Impact Aid Funding

LEA officials were asked about two aspects of Impact Aid funding that were reputed to be problematic: the reliability of funding and the timing of funding. The reliability of Impact Aid funding is an issue because of continuing Congressional debate about the level of and methods for Impact Aid payments. Anecdotal evidence, supported by the interview findings, suggests that Impact Aid LEAs feel they must continually lobby Congress to maintain Impact Aid funding. Timing was identified as an issue because, unlike most other Federal education programs, Impact Aid is not forward-funded. Although LEAs justify their need for Impact Aid funds in the Fall of the school year for which funds are required,

they did not, prior to 1994, receive their supporting payment until Spring or later, after the school-year's funds have typically been expended⁴⁴.

The following discussion summarizes LEA comments about the reliability and timing of Federal Impact Aid. These findings are based on the responses of 81 LEA officials. (Tabulations of comments concerning reliability and timing add to more than 81 since 49 LEAs mentioned both problems.)

LEA officials cited the Federal Impact Aid program as the most appropriate source for Federal financial assistance, but they were quick to describe the recent funding of this program as very unreliable. Seventy-three LEAs (90%) did not consider Impact Aid to be a reliable source of funding for the future. Among the eight LEA officials who reported funding to be reliable, three conditioned their response with the comment that they felt they must continue to lobby or "fight" for these funds.

The timing of Impact Aid was also a source of concern for many LEA officials. Fifty-seven (70%) of the 81 responding LEA officials reported experiencing problems with the timeliness of Impact Aid payments. Because LEAs' budgets are developed and allocated before the end of the school year, funds received in late Spring (as Impact Aid funds were before the 1994 amendments) are of limited utility for the current school year. All respondents desired some type of forward-funding arrangement to make Impact Aid funds available for the school year in which they are granted.

Impact Aid Funding Levels

Many LEA officials commented that funding sources such as Impact Aid have failed to keep pace with the increasing costs of educating students. Recent Defense drawdowns and military base closures, however, may have alleviated some of the Impact Aid funding shortfalls. As Table 7.5 shows, the Fiscal Year 1992 Federal Impact Aid payment was \$339 million for the education of about 220,000 Category A students (military-connected students living *on* military installations) and 357,000 Category B students (military-connected students living *off* military installations). The Fiscal Year 1995 Federal Impact Aid payment was \$330 million for the education of 172,000 Category A students and 307,000 Category B students. Thus, the number of students upon which these Impact Aid payments are based has decreased about 21 percent between 1992 and 1995. Since the total payment amount has decreased only slightly (3%), the overall effect, in terms of a per-pupil Impact Aid payment, is an increase of 23 percent over these years.⁴⁵

This seeming increase in Impact Aid payments may, however, be somewhat misleading. Although most of the decrease in the number of military-connected students over this period was due to reductions in DoD personnel, some of the decrease can be attributed to a change in the Impact Aid Law. Some students for which LEAs could receive Impact Aid payments in 1992 (i.e., children of Federal employees who live off Federal installations) were no longer considered eligible in 1995. As a result, LEAs are receiving payment for fewer Federally connected students than they had in the past. In addition, overall Impact Aid payment amounts remained fairly stable because many LEAs received funding in 1995 under a "hold

⁴⁴ Although Congress mandated in 1994 that prior-year funding would thereafter be used to determine Impact Aid payments, payments were delayed again for the 1995-96 school year because that year's appropriations bill was not passed until April 1996. Therefore, at the time of the interviews, the statutory change had not yet affected the timing of payments in a manner that was visible to the interviewees and this was still a major concern.

⁴⁵ The inflationary increase from 1992 to 1995 (using 3.5% per year) would be approximately 11%. Thus, the 23% increase represents about a 12% net increase when adjusting for inflation.

harmless” provision. This provision guarantees that an LEA receives at least 85% of what it received the preceding year. Future per-student payments are thus likely to decline from 1995 levels.

To examine Impact Aid payments for specific LEAs, it is necessary to use data for Fiscal Year 1994; this is the most recent year for which these data are available at the LEA level. In that year, 1,642 LEAs received \$366 million in Federal Impact Aid (see Table 7.6). This funding was provided to support the education of 552,794 military-connected students, of which 204,460 (37%) were Category A students and 348,334 (63%) were Category B students. Payments for these two types of military-connected students were as follows: \$323 million was paid to support Category A students (\$1,578 per Category A student), and \$44 million was paid to support Category B students (\$125 per Category B student).

Table 7.5.
Federal Impact Aid Payments for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1995

Fiscal Year	Category A Students (military-connected)			Category B Students (military-connected)			Total Category A and B Students (military-connected)		
	Number	Payment	Payment Per Student	Number	Payment	Payment Per Student	Weighted Number ¹	Payment	Payment Per Wtd Student
1992	219,928	\$299M	\$1,360	357,467	\$40M	\$112	255,675	\$339M	\$1,326
1995	172,211	\$289M	\$1,678	307,187	\$41M	\$133	202,930	\$330M	\$1,626
Change 1992 to 1995	-47,717	-\$10M	\$319	-50,280	\$1	\$22	-52,745	-\$9M	\$300
Percent Change	-22%	-3%	23%	-14%	3%	19%	-21%	-3%	23%

Source: National Association of Federally Impacted Schools.

¹ Category A students are weighted 1.0 and Category B students are weighted 0.1 (as per Public Law No. 103-382).

The 93 target LEAs represent only 6 percent of the total 1,642 LEAs that received Fiscal Year 1994 Federal Impact Aid payments. However, the 203,302 military-connected students enrolled in these target LEAs represent 37 percent of the total number of military-connected students supported by Fiscal Year 1994 payments. The target LEAs also received \$193 million, or 53 percent, of the \$366 million Fiscal Year 1994 Impact Aid payment. (Payments to individual target LEAs ranged from \$8 thousand to \$31 million; the average payment was \$3 million.)

These figures show that the 93 target LEAs received a larger amount of Impact Aid funding on a per-student basis than did other LEAs. For example, in the 93 target LEAs, payments averaged \$1,840 per Category A student and \$171 per Category B student. Among the remaining 1,549 Impact Aid LEAs, payments averaged \$1,350 per Category A student and \$104 per Category B student. This higher level of funding for the target LEAs is not unexpected. In years when there is insufficient money to fund each LEA fully (as has been true since at least 1982), the Impact Aid distribution formula includes additional factors designed to ensure that LEAs with greater percentages of Federally-connected students and/or greater reliance on Impact Aid funding receive a higher percentage of Impact Aid funds.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, it will be seen below that even though these LEAs receive higher-than-average Impact Aid payments, they have relatively low per-pupil expenditures, particularly from local sources.

⁴⁶ See Appendix F, Table F.9 for an explanation of how Impact Aid Basic Support Payments are calculated.

Table 7.6.

Comparison of 93 Target LEAs to Other Impact Aid LEAs, Fiscal Year 1994

Student Group	Enrollments and Impact Aid Funding				
	Target LEAs (n=93)		Other LEAs (n=1,549)		Total (N=1,642)
	Count/Amount	%	Count/Amount	%	Count/Amount
Category A Students					
Number	94,777	46	109,683	54	204,460
Payment	\$174,431,296	54	\$148,107,200	46	\$322,538,496
Payment per student	\$1,840		\$1,350		\$1,578
Category B Students					
Number	108,525	31	239,809	69	348,334
Payment	\$18,548,237	43	\$25,013,588	57	\$43,561,825
Payment per student	\$171		\$104		\$125
Category A and B Students	203,302	37	349,492	63	552,794
Total (Weighted ¹) Category A and B Students					
Number	105,360	44	133,644	56	239,293
Payment	\$192,979,533	53	\$173,120,788	47	\$366,100,321
Payment per weighted student	\$1,827		\$1,295		\$1,530

Source: U. S. Department of Education, *Impact Aid Program, Section 3 Recipient Districts* (Report DHSC8772), March 11, 1996; DoD DDESS Directory, School Year 1995-1996

¹Category A students are weighted 1.0 and Category B students are weighted 0.1 (as per Public Law No. 103-82).

DoD Supplemental Funds

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the communities that educate relatively high proportions of military-connected students are feeling increasingly burdened with the expense of educating these children. To remedy this situation, DoD funds have been used to supplement Impact Aid for those LEA's most affected by a military presence.⁴⁷ These DoD "supplemental" funds are allocated to LEAs based on two criteria: (a) the LEA must have a minimum proportion of its enrollment consisting of DoD-connected students (i.e., children of military or civilian employees of DoD); or (b) the LEA must have experienced a sharp increase in its DoD-connected enrollments as a result of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) decisions.

The funding history of the DoD supplemental funds is shown in Table 7.7; the level of funding for this program has varied from year to year. In addition, the eligibility criterion for LEAs has been lowered three times in the program's seven years, resulting in a wider dispersal of funds. The program received an initial authorization, but no appropriation, in Fiscal Year 1990. In 1991, the program was funded at \$10

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Section 386 of Public Law No. 102-484, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, as amended by Section 373 of Public Law No. 103-160, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, and Section 1074 of Public Law No. 104-106, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

million, with funding allocated to LEAs that had a minimum of 35 percent DoD-connected students. No funds were appropriated in 1992. In 1993 and 1994, supplemental funds were allocated to LEAs that had a minimum of 30 percent DoD-connected students. In 1993, an additional \$8 million (not shown in Table 7.7) was appropriated to the U.S. Department of Education to allocate to LEAs affected by BRAC decisions. BRAC funds were included in the 1994 DoD appropriation. In 1995, neither part of the program was funded. Fiscal Year 1996 funding consisted of a \$35 million appropriation distributed as (a) \$30 million to LEAs that had a minimum of 20 percent DoD-connected students and (b) \$5 million to LEAs affected by BRAC decisions.

Table 7.7.
DoD Supplemental Funding History, 1990-1996

Fiscal Year	Amount Appropriated	Minimum Eligibility Percent (DoD- connected Students)
1990	0	—
1991	\$10 million	35
1992	0	—
1993	\$50 million	30
1994	\$40 million	30
1995	0	—
1996	\$35 million	20

Source: DoDEA.

Of the 93 target LEAs included in the present study, 78 LEAs received an allocation from the 1996 DoD supplement (see Appendix F, Table F.11). These 78 LEAs received a total of \$26.5 million (88%) of the \$30 million allocation. In addition, 8 of the 93 target LEAs received \$3.3 million (66%) of the \$5 million reserved for LEAs affected by BRAC decisions.

When officials from the 93 target LEAs were asked their opinion about DoD supplemental funds, 73 responded. In general, the officials reported that these DoD funds were very well received. Fifty-three (73%) of the LEAs expressed satisfaction with the timeliness of these funds and with their flexibility (i.e., the lack of restrictions on how funds are used). Although LEAs found these funds useful, about one half (47%) indicated that DoD supplemental funds comprised only a very small part of their budgets.

Overall LEA Funding

This section of the report examines funding sources and levels among the 93 target Impact Aid LEAs. The section compares LEA funding sources and levels to state and national averages to help determine how funding for these LEAs differs from funding for LEAs that enroll fewer military-connected students (and are thus less reliant on Federal Impact Aid). In addition, Impact Aid payments are compared to computed “maximum need” levels to shed more light on LEAs’ Impact Aid funding needs.

LEA Funding Sources

Funding for an LEA’s education programs comes primarily from three major sources—Federal, state, and local governments. As previously discussed, LEAs enrolling military-connected students have a

reduced tax base from which to generate local revenues to support their education programs. These LEAs rely on Impact Aid to offset these shortfalls. As a result, among these Impact Aid LEAs, the proportion of funds received from Federal, state, and local sources is quite different from that for other LEAs.

Table 7.8 provides funding source profiles for school year 1992-93 (the most recent year for which data are available). Nationwide, the average public school district received 7 percent of its funds from Federal sources, 46 percent from state sources, and 47 percent from local sources. The 84 target LEAs for which these data were available received proportionately more of their funds from Federal (11%) and state sources (67%), and less from local sources (22%). (Table F.12 in Appendix F provides a listing of the 84 LEAs and the distribution of their funding sources.) This shift in funding sources does not appear to be due to the particular states in which the target LEAs reside. Table 7.8 shows that funding source averages for the target states (that is, the 34 states in which the target LEAs are located) are similar to those for the nation as a whole, but different from those for the target LEAs. Sixty-three of the 84 LEAs for which data were available had a Federal-source percentage at or above the 34-state average and 62 had a state-source average at or above the 34-state average; only 8 LEAs had a local-source percentage at or above the 34-state average.

Table 7.8.

1992-93 Education Funding Sources for the Nation, Target States, and Target LEAs

Average Percentages for:	Percent of 1992-93 Revenues from Source		
	Federal Govt.	State Govt.	Local Govt.
Nation	7	46	47
Target LEAs (<i>n</i> =84)	11	67	22
Target states (<i>n</i> =34)	7	48	44

Source: Snyder, Hoffman, & Geddes, 1996, Table 157; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, School Years 1987-88 through 1992-93

The target LEAs also receive proportionately more funding from Federal and state sources and less from local sources than does the average LEA *in their state*. Among the 84 target LEAs for which data are available, 59 had a Federal-source percentage at or above the average for their state. Similarly, 62 target LEAs had a state-source percentage at or above their state average. In contrast, only 16 target LEAs had a local-source percentage at or above the state average.

In all of these of comparisons, the higher Federal contribution is to be expected—The target LEAs were selected because of their relatively high proportions of military-connected students, implying higher levels of Federal Impact Aid funding (than in other LEAs). On the other hand, what appears to be a higher level of state funding is most likely an artifact of these LEAs' decreased reliance on local funding. Since the 34 state education agencies all allocate funds based on an LEA's total number of students, regardless of the student's "Federal connection," the state's contribution is essentially the same (on a per-pupil basis) for the all LEAs within the state. Thus, if the increase in Federal funding were fully compensating these LEAs for the Federally related shortage of local revenues, the percentage of funds received from state sources would be about the same for the two groups. Likewise, the percentage of funds from Federal and local sources *combined* would be about the same. Because the increase in Federal funding does not fully compensate these LEAs for their lack of local revenues, a larger part of these LEAs' budgets come from state sources, and a smaller percentage comes from Federal and local sources combined.

One final note on this topic. The distribution of funding sources appears to have remained quite stable in recent years. This is true both at the national level and among the target LEAs. For example, school year 1989-90 national averages for Federal, state, and local revenues were 6 percent, 47 percent, and 47 percent, respectively, compared to 1992-93 averages of 7, 46, and 47 percent (Snyder et al., 1996). Among the target LEAs, the average percentages for Federal, state, and local revenues were 11, 67, and 22 in 1989-90, exactly the same as in 1992-93 (National Center for Education Statistics, 1995).

LEA Funding Levels

To examine funding levels, each LEA's PPE was compared to its state average PPE and the national average PPE.⁴⁸ Data used in these comparisons were available for all 93 LEAs included in the study. These data are presented in Table F.13 in Appendix F. Again, the most recent data available were for school year 1992-93.

In 1992-93, the PPEs for the 93 target LEAs averaged \$5,159, and ranged from a low of \$3,085 to a high of \$13,558. The national average PPE for all public school districts in that year was \$5,584, slightly higher than that for the target LEAs. Comparing each target LEA's PPE to the national average shows that 67 LEAs (72%) had PPEs below the national average. Differences between these 67 LEA PPEs and the national average ranged from a few dollars to as much as \$2,499.

To some extent, the difference in LEA and national PPEs may reflect the fact that the target LEAs are located in states with lower PPEs. The average PPE for the 34 target states was \$5,457—\$127 below the national average PPE. To adjust for this, each target LEA's PPE also was compared to the average PPE for its state. This comparison shows that many of the target LEAs had below-average PPEs even among the LEAs within their states. Sixty-four (69%) LEAs had PPEs below their state average PPE. Differences between these 64 target LEA PPEs and state average PPEs ranged from a few dollars to as much as \$4,052.

Thus far, this section of the report has shown that (a) the target LEAs have below-average PPEs and (b) these LEAs rely more on state and Federal funding and less on local funding than do other LEAs. These findings seem to support the views of organizations that represent Federally affected LEAs (e.g., National Association of Federally Impacted Schools and the Military Impacted Schools Association). These organizations believe that the Federal government should assume a larger share of the funding for LEAs that educate military-connected students (see Proulx, 1997). They advocate increased Federal Impact Aid funding, while noting that the Impact Aid program is presently funded at only about half of current need.⁴⁹ Most of the interviewed state and local officials also noted that Federal Impact Aid would be a more viable program if it were funded at a level sufficient to offset LEA shortfalls in local revenues. A common complaint was that Impact Aid payments are not adequate to meet the costs of educating military-connected students.

Impact Aid as Compensation for Reduced Local Contribution

This subsection of the report uses LEA Impact Aid funding data and procedures outlined in the Impact Aid statute to investigate the concerns discussed above. More specifically, two measures (defined

⁴⁸ All PPEs are based on current expenditures (see "Definitions" in Snyder et al., 1996).

⁴⁹ Current need as used here refers to the LEA Maximum Basic Support Payment; this measure is discussed more fully in the following sub-section.

in the Impact Aid Statute) are used to examine the extent to which Impact Aid payments compensate LEAs for reduced local contributions that result from a Federal presence.

1. The *LEA Maximum Impact Aid Basic Support Payment* is the amount of Impact Aid funding an LEA would receive if the Impact Aid program were fully funded. It is the amount an LEA is “entitled” to receive under the law.
2. The *Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifier* (LOT MOD) indicates the extent to which an LEA is dependent on Impact Aid funds. It is calculated by adding together two percentages: (a) the percentage of an LEA’s operating budget that would come from Impact Aid if Impact Aid were fully funded; and (b) the percentage of the LEA’s total average daily attendance that consists of Federally-connected students.⁵⁰ Thus, the LOT MOD will be higher when an LEA has a greater reliance on Impact Aid (i.e., it has more Federally-connected students and/or more of its budget comes from Impact Aid).

Data on these two measures are provided for all 93 target LEAs for Fiscal Year 1994 (the most recent year for which Impact Aid data are available). The new funding formula enacted by P.L. 103-382 did not apply in Fiscal Year 1994; the analysis presented here thus reflects allocations under the old Impact Aid Law. These data are summarized in Table F.13 in Appendix F.

In Fiscal Year 1994, the Maximum Basic Support Payments for the 93 LEAs totaled \$307 million. In other words, if the Impact Aid program had been fully funded, these 93 LEAs would have received \$307 million in that year. In reality, the total Fiscal Year 1994 Impact Aid payment for the 93 LEAs was \$193 million. Thus, in Fiscal Year 1994, the target LEAs received 63 percent of the maximum authorized.⁵¹

The LOT MOD for the target LEAs indicated that these LEAs have a wide range of dependence on Impact Aid funding; the LOT MODs ranged from 1 percent to 100 percent, with an average of 50 percent. Twelve LEAs had modifiers of 100 percent. (Seven of these districts were coterminous LEAs.)

Together, these compensation and dependence indices show that LEAs with a greater dependence on Impact Aid funding tended to receive a higher proportion of the maximum payment than did LEAs with a lesser dependence on these funds (see Table 7.9). For example, LEAs with a LOT MOD of 20 percent or less received 38 percent of their maximum payment, while LEAs with LOT MODs of over 80 percent received 73 percent of their maximum payment. This finding suggests that (as intended) the “old” Impact Aid funding formula minimized, to some extent, the financial burden placed on LEAs that have the greatest reliance on these funds. The new formula is designed to do this to an even greater extent.

⁵⁰ The Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifier cannot exceed 100 percent. When the sum of the two percentages exceeds 100, it is reduced to 100 percent.

⁵¹ These data calculations were based on Fiscal Year 1994 ADA data and the actual Impact Aid payments. Full payment calculations are underestimated as the calculations were based only on Military A and B students and not all Federally-connected students.

Table 7.9.

Target LEAs' Dependence on Impact Aid versus Compensation Received

Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifier (LOT MOD)	Percent of Maximum Basic Support Payment Received
1-20% (<i>n</i> =14)	38
21-40% (<i>n</i> =26)	50
41-60% (<i>n</i> =23)	65
61-80% (<i>n</i> =9)	61
81-100% (<i>n</i> =21)	73
All 93 LEAs	63

Source: Table F.13, Appendix F

Summary

The issue of who—local, state, and/or Federal governments—is responsible for the education of military-connected students appears to be unresolved; states and LEAs often disagree on who is responsible for the education of these students. Most target LEAs and their states are ready to assume at least some of this responsibility. In fact, LEAs were more likely than states to view the education of military-connected students as a local responsibility, and states were more likely than LEAs to view this as a state responsibility. Nonetheless, one half of the target LEAs and over one third of the target states felt the Federal government bears some responsibility for the education of students who live *on* military installations. Not surprisingly, both LEAs and states are more likely to believe the Federal government bears responsibility for the education of military-connected students who live *on*, rather than *off*, military installations. Local and state education officials based their opinions on financial, not legal, considerations. Funding was, in fact, one of these LEAs' main educational concerns, both in general and with regard to the education of military-connected students.

LEA officials felt that education funding was not keeping pace with increasing costs and that it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain local taxpayer support for education. Nearly all state and LEA officials felt that Impact Aid funding was critical to the task of educating military-connected children. Although many education officials were concerned about recent declines in Impact Aid funding, the actual level of that decline is unclear. The net effect of recent declines in Impact Aid and in the number of military-connected students has been an *increase* in per-student Impact Aid funding for the 93 target LEAs, at least for the period from 1992 through 1995. However, during that period the number of students considered eligible for Impact Aid funding also was reduced, and a hold harmless provision mitigated funding declines. Therefore, it is difficult to gauge how Impact Aid funding levels are actually changing.

One fact is certain: The Impact Aid program continues to be funded at levels below the maximum authorized. In 1994, the 93 LEAs in this study received only 63 percent of full (or maximum) Impact Aid payment levels. This places additional financial burdens on local communities, a situation that troubles many state and LEA education officials. The fact that Impact Aid is not forward-funded also causes budgeting difficulties for LEAs. As educational costs increase and other education funding sources fail to keep pace with these costs, Impact Aid shortfalls become a more serious issue for LEAs. DoD supplemental funds are a partial solution to some of these problems with Impact Aid funding. These funds have been well received, although their utility for any one LEA may be declining as payments continue to be more widely disbursed.

The target LEAs in this study rely on Impact Aid to make up for reduced local contributions from (tax-exempt) military personnel. It is thus not surprising that these target LEAs receive proportionately more of their education funding from Federal sources and less from local sources, relative to other LEAs. These LEAs also get proportionately more funding from the state government than do other LEAs, suggesting that Federal increases are not fully compensating LEAs for local decreases. The target LEAs' average per-pupil funding level is lower than both the national average and the average for their respective states.

Chapter 8: Findings and Conclusions

This chapter summarizes findings from the Congressionally requested study of (a) the DoD DDESS schools and (b) LEAs with enrollments consisting of over 30-percent military-connected students (Impact Aid LEAs). Previous studies of DDESS schools relied primarily on funding analyses (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1986) or intensive case study methodology (Bodilly et al., 1988; Purnell et al., 1991). In contrast, this DDESS investigation employed a multi-method approach, involving surveys of military parents with children enrolled in the DDESS system; on-site interviews with base commanders, DDESS superintendents, and LEA superintendents; and telephone interviews with state education officials. The LEA portion of the study also utilized a multi-method approach, consisting of surveys of military parents of LEA students, telephone interviews with local and state education officials, and extracts from published data on LEA funding.

This chapter is presented in two main sections. This chapter first reviews the main findings and conclusions of the DDESS portion of the study and then reviews the main findings and conclusions of the Impact Aid LEA portion of the study.,

The DDESS Schools

Findings Concerning Education Quality

DDESS parents have a very high opinion of the quality of education in the DDESS schools. A large majority of these parents gave their child's DDESS school high ratings in terms of the quality of specific education programs and the school itself. DDESS parents' ratings were substantially higher than those provided by a national sample of public-school parents.

DDESS parents appear to value both the quality of the DDESS educational programs and the additional benefits that these schools provide. These schools were viewed as an important part of the quality of installation life and as an extension of the military's family support system. The DDESS schools were viewed as providing safe and disciplined environments congruent with a military lifestyle and parental expectations. Parents' strong feelings about community ownership of the DDESS schools were reflected in high levels of parental involvement and volunteerism in these schools.

The DDESS schools offer a level of responsiveness to the needs of military children—particularly those due to high mobility and parents' short-notice deployment—that local schools cannot easily duplicate. DDESS schools provide more extensive services (e.g., counseling and testing for placement) to accommodate students who join the school in the middle of the school year. They provide additional support services for students experiencing the stresses of parental deployment. Links between the schools, other military service programs, and the installation chain of command create a partnership that supports military students in ways that could not be attained with a different school structure. These unique advantages of the DDESS schools appear to contribute to parents' high opinions of the quality of education provided by the schools.

Thus, some of the positive perceptions of DDESS school quality appear to result from the functioning of these schools as "installation" schools—i.e., as schools that are located on the installation and enroll only installation children. An installation-school structure, however, does not account for the full value placed on these schools' education quality. The remainder is likely due to some combination of true quality differences and other factors.

Findings Concerning Transfer

Opinions on transfer. This study's findings on the potential transfer of the DDESS schools echo those reported by its predecessors (Bodilly et al., 1988; Purnell et al. 1991)—Opposition to transferring the DDESS schools to the local public schools remains high. DDESS superintendents felt a transfer would sacrifice education quality. They noted that the unique benefits provided by the DDESS schools (discussed above) would be lost if a transfer occurred. Installation commanders noted that military quality-of-life benefits have been declining. These commanders believed that the loss of another benefit would have a negative effect on troop morale and could make assignments to their installations less desirable. DDESS parents also strongly opposed transfer of the schools. These parents had many concerns about a potential transfer. In addition to concerns about educational quality, parents were concerned about broader issues that indirectly affect educational quality, such as student safety, the unique needs of military students, and neighborhood schooling. In general, the more highly parents' rated the quality of the DDESS schools compared to the local schools, the more opposed they were to a transfer. Nonetheless, opposition existed even when the two types of school systems were viewed to be of equal quality. This opposition presumably resulted from parents' awareness of the additional advantages that DDESS schools provide for military students.

Most state and local education officials in locales with DDESS systems acknowledged their responsibility to provide an education for military-connected students who reside on military installations. Nevertheless, these officials viewed the issue of transfer with caution, anticipating a variety of problems that would result from a change in the status quo. For both state and local officials, the issue of funding was paramount in any consideration of transfer. Their concerns centered on the potential costs of a transfer: the increased financial burden on LEAs and local communities due to an increased student population without an increased tax base; costs of both initial and continuing facilities maintenance, construction, and renovation; and costs of administering the initial transition. In theory, Impact Aid should cover the first of these costs. LEA officials, however, saw an uncertain future for Impact Aid and were skeptical that appropriate levels of funding would be forthcoming. Their concerns have a basis in the funding history of this Federal program. Impact Aid has not been funded at the maximum authorized levels since before 1982; funding levels (at the time data for this report was compiled) were at 53 percent of the maximum authorized.

Transfer Pros and Cons

Whether the DDESS schools should be transferred to state and local control is an issue that cannot be resolved by this study. Many of the issues central to a transfer decision (e.g., Federal funding implications) were examined here only at a broad, general level. Nonetheless, based on the cumulative findings of this study, past studies on the transfer issue, and recent Federal experiences with base closures, many of the factors that would argue for and against a transfer can be delineated.

Arguments for a transfer. Earlier studies (e.g., Bodilly et al., 1988) seem to have been prompted by the argument that a transfer of the DDESS schools could produce Federal cost savings, or at least eliminate the unwelcome possibility of trading defense priorities for education needs during DoD budget negotiations. Transfer of the DDESS schools would eliminate the conflict among defense priorities, but Federal cost savings resulting from transfer of the schools are difficult to evaluate. Initial costs could be high, but it is likely that a transfer would result in a Federal cost savings in the long-run. The cost savings would largely result from the Federal government paying for only the local share of the costs of educating the current DDESS students, rather than the full costs of their DDESS education. Thus, for example, the annual Impact Aid cost of \$83 million (at full funding levels) would be less than the annual 15-site DDESS

budget of \$198 million. (These cost savings could be reduced by other Federal costs that might be agreed to during transfer negotiations, such as supplemental funding for future capital outlays.)

One barrier to transfer that existed in the past was that some states and LEAs were not prepared to assume responsibility for the education of military-connected students who lived on military installations. This barrier is less a factor today. The states and LEAs that would receive the current DDESS students are mostly *willing* to accept the responsibility of educating these students (and are able to do so under certain conditions).

Legally, a transfer decision must be accompanied by a determination that the local schools to which the DDESS students would be transferred can provide an “appropriate” education. Although this term is not defined (and is extremely difficult to define), the fact that many students associated with the installations that have DDESS systems are currently educated by the local schools suggests that these local schools do provide an “appropriate” education. While this situation does not in itself prove that the local schools are “appropriate,” it could be used with other evidence to support that argument.

Past studies on the transfer of the DDESS schools recommended a transfer of some or all of these school systems (Bodilly et al., 1988; Purnell et al., 1991; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1986). Conditions that existed at the time of those studies are mainly unchanged, suggesting that the conclusions of those studies still apply. The one major change that has occurred is that the local schools around the installations with DDESS systems have become more crowded. This change means that a transfer would have to involve a transfer of facilities as well as students. Thus, a transfer of some or all of the DDESS systems should still be feasible, as long as DDESS facilities can be transferred as well.

Since the earlier studies were completed, DoD has been in a “drawdown” mode. Individual facilities and entire military installations have been closed. Military organizations have been completely restructured, and others have been relocated. This DoD drawdown experience could be applied to a transfer of DDESS schools. Transferring DDESS schools would not be easy. Although 75 DDESS schools have been transferred to local operation since 1950, the most recent transfer (not associated with a base closure) took place 24 years ago (in 1973) at Tyndall Air Force base, Florida. The 15 DDESS systems that remain today are in locations where the conditions for transfer had been most difficult to accomplish. Nonetheless, DoD has recent experience with difficult closures that should be helpful in planning and implementing DDESS transfers.

The loss of the DDESS schools would undoubtedly be viewed as another loss of a military quality-of-life benefit. But unlike many other benefit cuts (e.g., in retirement benefits) that affect all or most military service members, the loss of this benefit would affect a small proportion of military service members. DDESS students comprise only three percent of all school-aged children of active-duty service members, and parents of DDESS students are less than two percent of all active-duty service members.

Arguments against a transfer. Other factors argue against a transfer. First, as this and past studies have shown, no one who would be involved in or affected by a transfer unequivocally supports a transfer; most of the involved parties oppose a transfer. This opposition, particularly among military parents, could lead to efforts to prevent a transfer, at the installation level if not at the Federal level. Military personnel’s level of opposition is difficult to predict or quantify, but the past transfer effort at Quantico suggests that opposition can be strong—strong enough to stop a transfer.

One reason DDESS parents oppose a transfer is a fear that they would lose their present degree of school governance. Currently the DDESS schools are run with input from an elected school board, composed primarily of military parents. In the event of a transfer, military parents typically could serve on

local school boards only if they were legal residents of the LEA's state/county. While there may be practical reasons why military members would prefer not to obtain local residency, military members' spouses (who are not covered by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act) may be obliged to change their residency with each family move. These spouses, at least, should be eligible to run for or be appointed to local school boards. However, because of the frequency with which military members and their families move, serving on local school boards may be difficult for other reasons. Military families may not be in a location long enough to build the voter support necessary to win an elected position or to obtain the recognition needed to acquire an appointed position. In addition, few or no school board positions may become available (i.e., there may be no elections or appointments) during the relatively brief time a military family is stationed in an area. Military parents thus could be precluded from *any* opportunity to serve on the local school board.

The initial cost to the Federal government of a transfer is difficult to estimate, but is likely to be high. Two of these costs can be estimated. First, at the full funding level (which is desired by LEAs and recommended by this report), the total amount of Impact Aid funding that would be required to transfer all 15 DDESS systems is about \$83 million. Second, the cost to correct current maintenance and construction backlogs at all 15 sites is estimated at \$118 million. (Although a 5- to 10-year plan has been established to eliminate these backlogs, funding has yet to be provided.) There would also be additional costs, such as the administrative costs of transitioning DDESS personnel to LEA employment, reimbursement to local educational agencies for associated (initial and continuing) transfer costs, and the legal costs of negotiating a transfer at each of the 15 DDESS locations. In the face of pressure to reduce Federal spending levels, Congressional legislators may find it difficult to allocate sufficient funds to cover these initial transition costs.

Although this study was not asked to determine whether the DDESS schools provide a better education than do the adjacent public schools, it is clear that (a) parents of DDESS students perceive the DDESS schools to be better than the local schools and (b) the DDESS schools offer a number of programs and services specifically designed to meet the needs of military students. Thus, it would appear that a transfer would entail the loss of an important benefit to military families. Although this loss directly affects relatively few military personnel, *all* personnel could view the transfer of DDESS schools as another in a series of benefit losses that indicate a declining commitment to and concern for the military family. As such, the loss of the DDESS schools could negatively affect military morale.

While none of the impediments to a transfer identified in this (or previous) studies is insurmountable, many may be difficult to resolve at this time. Chief among these is the capacity of most local school districts to absorb DDESS students (with or without transfer of the DDESS facilities). Most LEAs adjacent to the installations with DDESS systems are currently experiencing rapid enrollment growth and are overcrowded. Adding the DDESS students to these public school systems at this time may exacerbate their growth problems. The addition of DDESS students would be even more problematic for those fast-growing districts that are not experiencing concomitant growth in their tax base. Assuming responsibility for military-connected students that do not contribute fully to the local tax base would be difficult for LEAs at any time, but particularly when their enrollment growth is not being met with an expansion in the tax base. On the other hand, a transfer could help some LEAs deal with enrollment growth, at least for the LEAs gaining more in facilities and staff than in students.

If a transfer occurs, the LEAs that accept the current DDESS students would be dependent on Impact Aid to compensate them for their inability to collect property taxes from these students' families. These LEAs and their states are already wary of the Federal government's willingness or ability to provide what they see as fair compensation for the education provided to military-connected students. If a transfer occurs and Impact Aid remains significantly under-funded, tensions will likely increase between

installations that now have DDESS systems and the local communities that would educate the DDESS students, and between local and state education agencies and the Federal government.

Another funding issue arises at the state level. Although most states with DDESS sites are willing to provide the state share of per-pupil funding to LEAs that accept the current DDESS students, it is unclear how this would be done. States would either have to raise tax revenues or decrease their per-pupil payments to all LEAs in the state. Both options have negative consequences for state residents and LEAs. (For example, LEAs would probably find it harder to raise local education revenues if the state had just raised its education revenues). As a result of the increased funding burdens a transfer would place on state and local governments, tensions between these government agencies and both the military and the Federal government could increase as a result of a transfer.

Conditions for Transfer

According to state and local education officials, if the decision were made to transfer one or all DDESS systems, a number of conditions would have to be met before states and localities would accept the DDESS students. In addition, the Federal government would be expected to negotiate certain transfer issues. Although additional issues might be raised during transfer negotiations, the following list includes the most significant ones that states and localities believe would require Federal attention. Some of these issues apply to all 15 DDESS sites, others to selected sites. Interviews at all 15 sites raised the following conditions and issues.

- The Federal government would have to correct all DDESS construction backlogs and cover the costs to bring the DDESS facilities into compliance with relevant state and local building codes. With most local school facilities already at maximum capacity, a transfer of DDESS students would require the use of the current DDESS facilities at all installations. State and local officials expect the Federal government to provide them with facilities that are free of construction backlogs and that are in compliance with state and local building codes.
- LEAs are willing to consider hiring DDESS staff for positions that would be available after a transfer. Without Federal assistance, however, many of these staff members could lose significant tenure and seniority benefits. The Federal government would be expected to help negotiate adjustments in salaries, retirement, and other personnel benefits for the DDESS staff at each of the 15 sites.

Interviews at selected sites raised other transfer conditions and issues.

- The Federal government would have to provide higher levels of funding, and more reliable funding, than is currently provided by Impact Aid for the LEAs near Dahlgren, Fort Bragg, Fort Campbell, Fort Jackson, Fort Knox, Fort Stewart, Laurel Bay, Maxwell AFB, Robins AFB, and Quantico. LEA superintendents at these sites were not satisfied with the level of Impact Aid currently provided and/or with the reliability of this funding program. They do not want to assume the responsibility for educating more military-connected students until and unless more adequate funding is provided.
- The Federal government would have to provide up-front funding to cover LEAs' initial transition costs for the LEAs near Camp Lejeune, Fort Bragg, Fort Jackson, Fort Rucker, Fort Stewart, Laurel Bay, and Robins AFB. The LEA superintendents at these sites expect a transfer to entail significant costs for their agencies (for example, to cover transition planning

and staff hiring) and believe that these costs should be borne by the Federal government rather than by the LEA.

- The Federal government would have to provide additional funding to cover long-term facilities maintenance and capital improvement costs for the LEAs near Camp Lejeune, Fort Bragg, Fort Jackson, and Fort Stewart. Although funds for these costs are currently available under the current Impact Aid law, the LEAs apparently are not satisfied with the availability of these funds. They believe that annual Impact Aid payments (even at maximum amounts authorized) do not cover the costs of capital outlays. Thus, LEAs that accept additional facilities for the education of military-connected students believe the LEAs must pay for the upkeep of these facilities from their tax revenues. The LEAs at these sites believe that this cost should be a Federal responsibility, with guaranteed funding of facilities maintenance and capital improvements provided as part of a transfer agreement.
- The Federal government must be willing to negotiate a contractual funding arrangement for the LEA near West Point. This LEA currently has a contractual funding arrangement with the Federal government to provide education for the grade 9-12 students who live on West Point. The LEA would want the same type of arrangement (in lieu of Impact Aid) if it were to educate the West Point DDESS students. In order to educate these students in facilities on West Point, state laws would have to be amended to permit West Point to become part of the LEA's jurisdictional area.
- A physical transfer of students needs to be delayed five years at Dahlgren to allow the LEA to complete the construction of new school facilities. The level of overcrowding in this LEA is such that it cannot consider a transfer before that time.
- Potential jurisdictional conflicts would have to be resolved at the sites where more than one LEA has jurisdictional authority over students living on the installation. This situation exists at Fort Benning, Fort Campbell, Fort McClellan, and Fort Rucker. (Assuming Fort McClellan closes in 1999 as scheduled, the transfer is moot for that installation.)
- LEA access to facilities and/or students would have to be negotiated at sites where installations, or the area of the installation where the DDESS students or facilities are located, are secure. This situation applies at Camp Lejeune, Dahlgren, Fort Bragg (Pope AFB), Fort Campbell, Fort Knox, and Robins AFB.

Conclusions

This study uncovered many arguments against transfer, and no strong proponents for transfer at the current time. As in past studies, many general and site-specific conditions for transfer should be addressed before a transfer becomes feasible. In principle, none of these conditions pose insurmountable barriers to a transfer. Notwithstanding the position of DDESS superintendents, parents and military installation commanders, continuation of the current DDESS school system is much more difficult to justify than previously. Part of the rationale for establishing such schools (i.e., to avoid sending military students to local segregated schools) no longer applies. In addition, there is the continued philosophical argument that education is a state and local responsibility. Ultimately, the main arguments for or against a transfer come down to two major issues: Financial considerations and the perceived value of the DDESS schools to military personnel. The trade-off between these issues must be weighed in the context of budgetary priorities and military quality-of-life decisions.

Impact Aid LEAs

Findings Concerning Education Quality

Most military parents of children attending school in the 93 target Impact Aid (over 30% military-connected enrollment) LEAs seemed pleased with the quality of education in these schools. Parents' evaluations of LEA school quality were favorable, and generally comparable to those that public-school parents give about public schools in the nation at large. Since local education systems are geared to the civilian population, they may fall short of military parents' expectations in areas specific to the needs of military families. Military parents gave relatively low ratings to the LEA's responsiveness to the problems and needs of military students, and only a small proportion felt that they had an adequate voice in the decisions made about their children's educational programs.

It is difficult to gauge the level of satisfaction with these specific educational features since comparable data are available from only the *DDESS Survey*, but the relatively low ratings for these measures are consistent with two fears expressed by parents of DDESS students during the site visits and in the *DDESS Survey*. DDESS parents were concerned that a transfer to local public schools would mean that military students' needs would not be well-met and that their control over their child's education would diminish. It may be that the public schools, with their typically diverse student bodies, limited funding, and often large enrollments, are less able to provide the kind of individualized, personalized attention that military parents feel is warranted based on their experiences in a more close-knit community environment (the military).

Findings Concerning the Responsibility to Educate Military-connected Students

States and LEAs seldom agreed on who is responsible for the education of military-connected students who reside on an installation. This disagreement may arise over confusion between *legal* (administrative) versus *financial* responsibility for the education of military-connected students. Regardless of the reason, LEAs were more likely than states to view this responsibility as a local responsibility, while states were more likely than LEAs to view it as a state responsibility. Most states and LEAs are ready to assume at least some of this responsibility, but many also felt the Federal government bears some *financial* responsibility for the education of these students. States and LEAs appreciated Federal Impact Aid funds for military-connected students, but often viewed that funding as inconsistent and unreliable. The LEAs expressed significant apprehensiveness about the Federal government's commitment to providing financial help for the education of military connected students.

In sum, it appears that the Federal government can count on the vast majority of states and LEAs to accept at least some responsibility for the education of military-connected students who reside on military installations. Both states and LEAs are acutely aware, however, that families who live on military installations contribute less than their "fair share" to the taxbase supporting education. Since this situation results from the Federal government's exemption from taxation, states and localities view the Federal government as the responsible agency for reimbursing LEAs for their shortfall. Although there is an *expectation* that the Federal government will assume financial responsibility for the education of military-connected students, there is also a *fear* that the Federal government will not.

Findings Concerning Funding

LEA officials felt that educational funding in general has not kept pace with increasing costs and that it is increasingly difficult to obtain local support for education. Nearly all state and LEA officials felt

that Impact Aid funding is critical to the task of educating military-connected children. The fact that the program is no longer funded at the maximum amount allowable under current statute has placed additional financial burdens on LEAs and local communities and was of great concern to many education officials.

Most LEA officials interviewed for this study felt they must lobby Congress to ensure that Impact Aid funding remains adequate. The fact that the Impact Aid program is not forward-funded also causes budgeting difficulties for LEAs. As educational costs increase and other educational funding sources fail to keep pace with these costs, Impact Aid shortfalls become a more serious issue. Although DoD supplemental funds have provided a partial solution to some of these problems with Impact Aid funding, this supplemental program has also been erratically funded.

The Impact Aid program continues to be funded at levels below the maximum authorized. In Fiscal Year 1995, funding for the entire Impact Aid program was 53 percent of its maximum authorized level. In 1994, the 93 LEAs in this study (as a group) received no more than 63 percent of maximum Impact Aid payments. The Impact Aid allocation formula in effect in Fiscal Year 1994 was designed to distribute limited Impact Aid funds such that LEAs with greater reliance on Impact Aid funding receive a greater share of the funds. Funding analyses in this study suggest that this formula worked as intended. Nonetheless, even those LEAs with the greatest need (80%-100% reliance on Impact Aid) received no more than 73 percent of the maximum allowable payment. The new funding allocation formula (specified in Public Law No. 103-382) was designed to improve on this need-based distribution.

Relative to other LEAs, the 93 target LEAs received proportionately more of their funding from Federal sources and less from local sources. If the increases in Federal funding were fully compensating LEAs for their reduced local revenues, these LEAs would receive about the same share of their funding from state sources as do other LEAs; instead, these LEAs get proportionately more funding from state sources and less from local and Federal sources combined. On average, these target LEAs also have lower levels of per-pupil funding—lower than the national average and lower than the average for their respective states. These findings support the claims of organizations that represent Impact Aid LEAs: Current Impact Aid funding levels do not adequately compensate LEAs for the education of military-connected students.

Impact Aid funding levels are problematic for a number of reasons. First, the resulting shortfall in education funding can create tensions between the military installation, its personnel, and the local community. It also has the potential of lowering the quality of education received by both military and civilian children served by affected LEAs. Using Impact Aid to make Federal budget reductions at the expense of state and local educational agencies is also problematic. Unlike most Federal programs, Impact Aid does not provide a unique Federal “service.” Instead, this program allows state and local governments to continue to provide an on-going public service (education) without detriment. Impact Aid meets a Federal obligation to states and localities, an obligation resulting from the Federal exemption from state and local taxation.

Conclusions

Two major issues addressed in this study were the level and sources of funding for the target LEAs, including the role of Federal funding. These issues are important because these LEAs need to be compensated for the loss of revenue sources due to the Federal presence (be it military or otherwise). Current Impact Aid law is designed to provide LEAs with appropriate reimbursement levels for each type of Federally connected student. At present, under-funding prevents Impact Aid from providing sufficient reimbursement to offset this burden on localities.

Current Impact Aid funding levels have created tension between local communities and their neighboring military installations as localities must pay what they perceive to be a disproportionate share of the costs of educating Federally connected students. Moreover, these tensions are likely to escalate in communities where education costs are increasing and/or an installation's military population is growing at a faster pace than the local civilian population (e.g., as a result of BRAC). Although in some cases DoD supplementary funds have been provided, current DoD policy supports the Impact Aid program as the appropriate funding mechanism for compensating local communities for the costs of educating military-connected students. The current use of DoD supplemental funds for this purpose is problematic for two reasons. First, DoD opposes the use of Defense funding for other than Defense needs. Second, this funding is provided too inconsistently to allow LEAs to plan their budgets effectively.

References

- Bodilly, S. J., Wise, A. E., & Purnell, S. W. (1988). *The transfer of Section 6 schools: A case by case analysis* (R-3647-FMP). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Caliber Associates. (1996). *1995 Report card from DoDDS parents* (Contract No. MDA903-90C-0219). Fairfax, VA: Author.
- Elam, S. M., & Rose, L. C. (1995). The 27th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 41-56.
- Hudson, L., & Helmick, J. (Eds.). (in preparation). *Technical manual for the Survey of Parents' Opinions on Local Schools* (Report No. 97-015). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Hudson, L., & Helmick, J. (Eds.). (in preparation). *Technical manual for the Survey of Parents' Opinions on the Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools* (Report No. 97-014). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Military Impacted Schools Association. (1992). *Impact aid: P.L. 81-874 and P.L. 81-815*. Bellevue, NE: Author.
- National Association of Federally Impacted Schools. (1997). *School districts eligible for assistance under Section 386 of P.L.102-484, as amended, basic supplement and BRAC*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Education Statistics [CD-ROM]. (1995). *Common core of data (CCD): School years 1987-88 through 1992-93* (NCES 95-734). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Parents and schools: Partners in student learning* (NCES 96-913). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- National Education Goals Panel. (1995). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Proulx, P. L. (Ed.). (1997). *Impact aid blue book: 1996-1997 Edition*. Washington, DC: National Association of Federally Impacted Schools.
- Purnell, S. W., Wise, A. E., Bodilly, S. J., & Hudson, L. (1991). *Section 6 schools in six states: Eleven case studies of transfer issues* (N-2993-FMP). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Snyder, T. D., Hoffman, C. M., & Geddes, C. M. (1996). *Digest of education statistics, 1996* (NCES 96-133). Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Defense & U.S. Department of Education. (1995). *Construction, repair, and rehabilitation needs of dependent school facilities located on military installations in the United States*. Washington, DC: Authors.

- U.S. Department of Defense. (1995). *DoD DDESS directory, school year 1995-1996*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1996). *Impact aid program, Section 3 recipient districts* (Report DHSC8772). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1986). *DOD schools: Funding and operating alternatives for education of dependents* (GAO/HRD-87-16). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. House of Representatives. (1994). *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995*. 103d. Cong., 2d. Sess., H. Rept. 103-701.

APPENDIX A
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annotated Bibliography

Caliber Associates. (1996). *1995 report card from DoDDS parents* (Contract No. MDA903-90C-0219). Fairfax, VA: Author.

Caliber Associates present findings from the Department of Defense Education Activity's *1995 Report Card from Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DoDDS) Parents Survey*. The *DoDDS Report Card* is a biennial mail survey of parents whose children attend the overseas military-run DoDDS schools. The purpose of the survey is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the DoDDS system from a parent's perspective.

Surveys were distributed in Spring 1995 to the parents of all 84,471 children enrolled in the 190 DoDDS schools. Of those parents, 43,563 (52%) returned completed surveys. The survey instrument contained 35 questions, about one-half of which required parents to respond using an A, B, C, D, F grading scale. The survey collected parent views on issues such as overall DoDDS quality, curriculum, school personnel, school efforts to encourage parent participation, downsizing, lunch programs, and bus services.

Results of the 1995 survey are compared to the results of previous studies conducted in 1993, 1991, and 1989. The study reports that, in general, parent grades for the overall quality, curriculum, personnel and other components of DoDDS schools reflect high levels of parent satisfaction. Grades for most school components have improved substantially over the past six years, and parent concerns about most problem areas have decreased since 1989.

Bodilly, S. J., Wise, A. E., & Purnell, S. W. (1988). *The transfer of Section 6 schools: A case by case analysis*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

This report examines issues surrounding the transfer of six Department of Defense (DoD) Section 6 schools to state and local responsibility. Using a case-study approach, the report describes the opinions of those affected by such a transfer and notes factors that would facilitate or impede transfer at the six locations: Robins Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, Fort Knox, Fort Benning, Fort Campbell, and Camp Lejeune.

The study reviews alternative transfer options including no transfer, a contractual arrangement, school districts coterminous with the installation, full transfer, and an assisted transfer. The report identifies factors influencing the feasibility of a transfer at each location, including: sizes of the Section 6 and local school populations; interactions between systems; issues surrounding facilities ownership, operation, and upkeep; LEA financial capabilities; and school board representation of military parents.

In general, the report finds:

- All personnel connected with the Section 6 schools (school and installation personnel, and parents) believe that the educational programs offered to children under the Section 6 arrangement would decline if a transfer occurs.
- Military installation commanders view the Section 6 schools as a special benefit offered to the military family and fear that loss of this benefit may affect retention and morale.

- The primary factor affecting state and local willingness to accept responsibility for the Section 6 children is their ability to maintain adequate education funding levels after a transfer has occurred. State and local officials were wary of the ability of assistance programs such as Impact Aid to provide the necessary support. Most officials perceived the future of Impact Aid to be uncertain.

The study concludes that the transfer of Section 6 schools at any of the six sites would reduce the quality of the educational program offered to the Section 6 children. Nonetheless, site-specific findings from an analysis of each site's readiness for transfer are presented. Findings include the recommendation of a transfer option at each site:

- Robins Air Force Base—Transfer can be considered using an assisted transfer option, provided certain obstacles are overcome.
- Ft. Bragg—Transfer can be considered using an assisted transfer option, provided certain obstacles are overcome.
- Ft. Knox—Full transfer to the Hardin County school district can be considered, provided certain obstacles are overcome.
- Ft. Benning—Transfer to the Muscogee County school district can be considered using an assisted transfer option, provided certain impediments are addressed.
- Ft. Campbell—Jurisdictional difficulties preclude transfer at this time.
- Camp Lejeune—Impediments including extreme crowding in the LEA and the LEA's poor financial position preclude transfer at this time.

Elam, S. M., & Rose, L. C. (1995). *The 27th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

This report summarizes the main findings from the 27th in a series of annual polls on education. The report provides an in-depth exploration of a number of significant national education issues, including the public's grading of its schools; public awareness of educational issues; participation by Federal, state, and local governments in policy and financial decisions involving local schools; public and nonpublic school choice; higher achievement standards for students; inclusion of special education students in regular classrooms; financial assistance for college attendance; school prayer; problems facing the schools; violence in the schools; and ways of dealing with disruptive students. This survey was conducted from May to June 1995; data were collected from a telephone interview of 1,311 adults (18 years of age and older).

National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. (1995). *Common core of data (CCD): School years 1987-88 through 1992-93* (NCES 95-734, CD-ROM). Washington DC: Author.

The CCD is a comprehensive, annual, national statistical database of all elementary and secondary schools and school districts. It contains data that are comparable across all 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as the outlying territories under U.S. jurisdiction. The CD-ROM version of the CCD contains approximately 500,000 school

records, 100,000 agency records, and 330 state records. These data were originally collected by the United States Bureau of the Census.

National Education Goals Panel. (1995). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

This report is the fifth in a series of annual reports measuring progress toward the National Education Goals through the year 2000. The 1995 *Goals Report* consists of four documents: the *Core Report*, the *National and State Data Volumes*, and the *Executive Summary*. The *Core Report* focuses on approximately two dozen core indicators designed to convey to parents, educators, and policymakers progress in achieving the National Education Goals. The *National and State Data Volumes* include additional measures describing progress at the national level and progress individual states have made against their own baselines. The *Executive Summary* condenses this information and presents it in a format suitable for all audiences.

Purnell, S. W., Wise, A. E., Bodilly, S. J., & Hudson, L. (1991). *A RAND note: Section 6 schools in six states: Eleven case studies of transfer issues*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

This study is a follow-on to the 1988 study, *The Transfer of Section 6 schools: A case by case analysis*. The study applies the same case-study methodology as the 1988 study and completes RAND's survey of all 17 Section 6 schools located in the United States. Installations included in this analysis are Maxwell Air Force Base; Ft. McClellan, Ft. Rucker, Ft. Stewart, England Air Force Base, West Point, Ft. Jackson, Laurel Bay, Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center, and Quantico Marine Corps Base.

The case studies analyze the issues surrounding a possible transfer of these 11 Section 6 school systems to state and local responsibility. Each case study addresses two questions: (a) the extent to which a site is ready for transfer and (b) what type of transfer option (e.g., no transfer, contractual arrangement, coterminous district, full transfer, and assisted transfer) might be appropriate to that particular site. The study identifies the factors at each site that facilitate or impede a transfer, and recommends a transfer option for each site. Suggestions are also made on how some of the impediments to a transfer could be removed or ameliorated to facilitate a specific transfer option.

Findings and recommendations include consideration of the no transfer option at each site. The assisted transfer option is nearly always recommended as an alternative to no transfer.

Snyder, T. D., Hoffman, C. M., & Geddes, C. M. (1996). *Digest of education statistics, 1996* (NCES 96-133). Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

This publication is the 32nd edition of the *Digest of Education Statistics*. Its primary purpose is to provide a compilation of statistical information covering the broad field of American education from kindergarten through graduate school. The *Digest* includes a selection of data from many government and private sources, and draws largely on the results of surveys and activities carried out by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The publication contains information on a variety of educational topics,

including student enrollments; counts of schools and colleges, teachers, and college graduates; educational attainment; finances; Federal funds for education; employment and income of graduates; public libraries; and international data on education.

U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. Department of Education. (1995). *Construction, repair, and rehabilitation needs of dependent school facilities located on military installations in the United States*. Washington, DC: Authors.

This report describes a joint DoD and Department of Education (ED) survey of all military installations in the United States and Puerto Rico that have on-base schools (a) owned by DoD and ED and (b) operated by DoD or LEAs. The study was directed by the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations Report in the Fiscal Year 1993 DoD Appropriations Bill (Committee Report Number 102-627, dated June 29, 1992). The purpose of this study was to determine current school facility requirements and to assess: the condition of school facilities on military installations in the United States; the requirements for remedial maintenance to bring school facilities up to an acceptable condition, including meeting applicable building codes; and the feasibility and desirability of transferring ownership of facilities to local school districts that provide educational services at military installations. The study includes a funding plan for correcting maintenance backlogs over the next five years and construction backlogs over the next 10 years.

U. S. General Accounting Office. (1986). *DOD schools: Funding and operating alternatives for education of dependents* (GAO/HRD-87-16). Washington, DC: Author.

This report discusses alternative methods for operating and funding DoD dependents' schools located on 17 military installations in the United States (West Point, Quantico Marine Corps Base, Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center, Ft. Knox, Ft. Bragg, Camp Lejeune, Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Ft. Jackson, Beaufort-Laurel Bay Marine Corps Air Station, Ft. Stewart, Robins Air Force Base, Ft. Benning, Ft. McClellan, Ft. Rucker, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ft. Campbell, and England Air Force Base).

In the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1985 (Public Law No. 98-407), Congress directed the General Accounting Office (GAO) to determine the most suitable alternative for funding and operating these DoD schools. GAO examined three alternative methods for educating military dependents who live on military installations: (a) local operation—LEAs operate the schools; (b) contract operation—DoD contracts with LEAs to provide education services; and (c) coterminous operation—dependents' schools operate as an LEA with a jurisdictional boundary that is the same as the military installation's.

GAO evaluated implementation of each of the three funding alternatives at each of the 17 military installations and concluded that coterminous operation would be the best alternative to operate the schools. GAO estimated that the coterminous alternative would save DoD about \$88 million annually. GAO also noted that *net* savings to the Federal government would be between \$43 and \$88 million, depending on whether Congress increased Impact Aid to reimburse LEAs for the limited local tax revenues available to LEAs under this alternative.

GAO further recommended that at each installation, a decision to change the method of funding and operating dependents' schools would have to be negotiated by the appropriate military department secretaries and the head of the state agency involved (as legislated at that time). Employee issues (e.g., employment opportunities, salary and benefit levels), jurisdictional concerns, and other impediments would have to be considered and resolved.

The report includes data on the characteristics of the 17 military school systems and their 26 adjacent local school districts, and comments in response to GAO's recommendations from both DoD and ED. DoD did not support the GAO view that a single option (the coterminous option) could be applied unilaterally to all 17 school systems. DoD supported an approach that considered the individual factors at each school to determine the best financial arrangement. ED favored the local operation alternative and supported transfer of the DoD schools to the local school districts.

Included as an appendix to the GAO report is the DoD plan for transferring the Section 6 schools to the local school districts. This plan was developed in response to a Congressional directive included in the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986 (P.L. 99-167). This Act directed the Secretary of Defense to submit, by March 1, 1986, an orderly plan to transfer all the Section 6 schools to the local school districts by July 1, 1990.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

SURVEY OF PARENTS' OPINIONS

ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DOMESTIC DEPENDENT

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS



RCS: DD-P&R(OT)1982
Exp. 11/8/1996

Department of Defense

Survey of Parents' Opinions on Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools



Photos: Courtesy of U.S. Department of Education

DMDC Survey No. 95002

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

PRIVACY NOTICE

In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-579), this notice informs you of the purpose of the survey and how the findings will be used. Please read it carefully.

AUTHORITY: 10 United States Code, Sections 136 and 2358.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Information collected in this survey will be used to sample opinions of military parents concerning the quality of education at the Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools, and on the possibility of a transfer of these schools to local public school systems. The information will be used in the development of policies to ensure that military dependents receive an appropriate education. Reports will be provided to Congress, the Secretaries of Defense and Education, and each Military Service. Some findings may be published by the Defense Manpower Data Center or professional journals, or reported in manuscripts presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. In no case will the data for identifiable individuals be reported.

ROUTINE USES: None.

DISCLOSURE: Providing information on this survey is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, your participation is encouraged so that the data will be complete and representative. Your questionnaire will be treated as confidential. Identifying information will be used only by persons engaged in, and for purposes of, the survey. Only group statistics will be reported.

ABOUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is part of a larger study the Department of Defense is conducting to collect information concerning the possibility of transferring the Department's Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS) to local school systems. DDESS superintendents, local school superintendents, and military installation commanders are also being interviewed as part of this study. The questionnaire asks for your opinions about two issues relevant to a potential transfer—the quality of education provided by DDESS and local schools, and specific aspects of a possible transfer of the DDESS schools to the local school system (district).

WHY ME?

You have been selected at random to be part of a sample of military parents who have children enrolled in a Department of Defense Domestic Dependent School. There are over 20,000 parents with students enrolled in these schools. Enough of these parents are being asked to complete this survey so that valid conclusions can be made about the views of parents from each military installation with a DDESS school.


TO WHICH CHILDREN AND SCHOOLS DOES THIS SURVEY APPLY? WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THE SURVEY?

This survey applies to children who currently attend the Department of Defense school named in the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire, or who previously attended this school in school year 1995–96. If you have (or had) more than one child in this school, please answer the questions for the child whose birthday is next. The survey also applies to the Department of Defense school named in the cover letter; **answer the questions for that school, even if your child no longer attends the school.** The survey should be completed by the parent or guardian most knowledgeable about your child's school.

REMEMBER: Answer these questions for the child who attends or attended the Department of Defense school named in the letter that came with this questionnaire.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the response circles.
- Do not make any marks outside the response circles.
- If you change your mind, erase old marks completely.
- Do not use ink, ballpoint, or felt tip pens.



WRONG MARKS



RIGHT MARK



1. Please read each of the following statements and fill the circle that best represents your opinion about your child's Department of Defense school.

Fill one circle on each line.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. This school's academic program is challenging and rigorous.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. This school is well-equipped; students have the necessary books and materials, access to computers, science labs, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. The quality of instruction at this school is good.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. This school provides additional help to students who have trouble learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. This school is providing my child with a good education.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. This school is not underfunded.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. This school has a good reputation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Students at this school are treated fairly, regardless of their race, sex, or social class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Students are often given grades A, B, C, D, or F to denote the quality of their work. Suppose your child's Department of Defense school was graded in the same way. For each item below, indicate which of the following grades best represents your view of the quality of the education your child is receiving at this school.

A = Excellent B = Good C = Satisfactory D = Poor F = Fail NA = Not applicable or no information

Fill one circle on each line.

	A	B	C	D	F	NA
a. Reading/English/language arts program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Mathematics program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Science program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Overall academic program (e.g., variety of courses, challenging material)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Support services provided by the school (testing and screening, individual counseling, assistance with course selection, and college and career guidance)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Special education programs (programs for disabled students)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Overall quality of the school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

3. Suppose the local public school district and all the public schools in the U.S. were graded in the same way (grades of A, B, C, D, or F). In Section A, indicate which of the following grades best represents your view of the quality of education in the local public school district. In Section B, indicate which of the following grades best represents your view of the quality of education in public schools in the U.S. as a whole.

A = Excellent B = Good C = Satisfactory D = Poor F = Fail NA = Not applicable or no information

Fill one circle on each line for Section A,
and one circle on each line for Section B.

	A. Local public schools						B. Public schools in the U.S. as a whole					
	A	B	C	D	F	NA	A	B	C	D	F	NA
a. Overall academic program (e.g., variety of courses, challenging material)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Support services provided by the school (e.g., counseling, testing and screening)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Special education programs (programs for disabled students)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Overall quality of the public schools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. To what extent do you feel that you have an adequate voice in decisions about the educational programs at your child's Department of Defense school? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Very large extent
☐ Large extent
☐ Moderate extent
☐ Small extent
☐ Not at all

5. To what extent was your decision to live on this military installation affected by each of the following factors?

Fill one circle on each line.

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
a. Base policy or duty requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Quality of base housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Convenience of living on base	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Lack of affordable housing in the local community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Availability of Department of Defense school(s)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Public safety in the local community (e.g., crime rates)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Other (specify) <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. What is your personal position on the potential transfer of the Department of Defense school your child attends to the local public school district? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Strongly support a transfer
☐ Somewhat support a transfer
☐ Neutral or undecided
☐ Somewhat oppose a transfer
☐ Strongly oppose a transfer

7. If the Department of Defense school your child attends became part of the local public school district, to what extent would you be concerned about each of the following issues?

Fill one circle on each line.

	Very concerned	Moderately concerned	Slightly concerned	Not concerned
a. Quality of instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Academic rigor of educational programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Variety of courses and educational programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Availability of special education programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Your ability to influence school policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Educational funding levels	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Educational staffing levels	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Attention given to the needs of military students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Student safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Links to base services and programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Possibility of student busing or the loss of neighborhood schools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following background information is needed to describe military families who participate in this survey. Answer questions 8–12 for your child (with the next birthday) who attends or attended the Department of Defense school named in the letter accompanying this survey.

8. In what grade is your child (with the next birthday) who attends this Department of Defense school? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Pre-Kindergarten ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 8 ☐ 11
☐ Kindergarten ☐ 3 ☐ 6 ☐ 9 ☐ 12
☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 7 ☐ 10

9. How long has this child attended this Department of Defense school? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Less than 1 year
☐ At least 1 year but not 2 years
☐ At least 2 years but not 3 years
☐ At least 3 years but not 4 years
☐ 4 years or more

10. Is this child of Spanish/Hispanic origin or descent? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ No (not Spanish/Hispanic)
☐ Yes (Mexican, Mexican-Amer., Chicano)
☐ Yes (Puerto Rican)
☐ Yes (Cuban)
☐ Yes (other Spanish/Hispanic)

11. What race do you consider this child to be? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ White
☐ Black or African-Amer.
☐ American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut
☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Other race (specify)

12. Is this child physically, emotionally, or learning disabled?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

13. How many children do you have who currently attend (or attended in 1995–96) Department of Defense schools on this military installation? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ 1 child
☐ 2 children
☐ 3 children
☐ 4 or more children

14. Do you have any children who currently attend (or attended in 1995–96) a local public school in a school district adjacent to this military installation?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

15. Did any of your children who attend the Department of Defense school also attend a local public school in a school district adjacent to this military installation (e.g., if you lived off the military installation during the current or past tour of duty)?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

16. In how many public school districts, if any, have your children attended school? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ 1 public school district
☐ 2 public school districts
☐ 3 public school districts
☐ 4 public school districts
☐ 5 or more public school districts
☐ None of my children have attended school in public school districts

17. What is the military service of your children's sponsor? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Army
☐ Navy
☐ Air Force
☐ Marine Corps
☐ Coast Guard
☐ My children's sponsor is not a military service member

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

18. What is the present rank/pay grade of your children's sponsor? (Mark only one; if both parents/guardians are military service members, mark the higher rank/pay grade.)

- ☐ Enlisted (E1–E4)
- ☐ Enlisted (E5–E6)
- ☐ Enlisted (E7–E9)
- ☐ Warrant Officer (W1–W3)
- ☐ Warrant Officer (W4 and above)
- ☐ Commissioned Officer (O1–O3)
- ☐ Commissioned Officer (O4 and above)
- ☐ My children's sponsor is not a military service member

19. Have any of your children ever attended a Department of Defense school located on the following military installations? (Mark all that apply; include your current military installation.)

Army

- ☐ Fort Benning
- ☐ Fort Bragg
- ☐ Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
- ☐ Fort Campbell
- ☐ Fort Jackson
- ☐ Fort Knox
- ☐ Fort McClellan
- ☐ Fort Rucker
- ☐ Fort Stewart
- ☐ U.S. Military Academy, West Point

Coast Guard

- ☐ Coast Guard Air Station, Puerto Rico

Navy

- ☐ Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center
- ☐ Roosevelt Roads Naval Air Station, Puerto Rico

Marine Corps

- ☐ Camp Lejeune
- ☐ Laurel Bay Marine Corps Base
- ☐ Quantico Marine Corps Base

Air Force

- ☐ England Air Force Base
- ☐ Maxwell Air Force Base
- ☐ Myrtle Beach Air Force Base
- ☐ Robins Air Force Base

20. Have any of your children ever attended a Department of Defense Dependent School located overseas?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

21. What date did you complete this questionnaire?

Month	Day	Year
<input type="radio"/> Jan		
<input type="radio"/> Feb		
<input type="radio"/> Mar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Apr	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> May	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> June	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> July	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Aug	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Sept	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Oct	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Nov	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Dec	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[illegible][illegible]

APPENDIX C

DDESS STATE AND LOCAL

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Telephone Interview Protocol for State Education Agency Officials with DDESS Systems

My name is [INTERVIEWER]. I am calling from Westat Incorporated on behalf of the U.S. Department of Defense Education Activity. We are conducting a study to collect information from State and local education officials regarding the potential transfer of the DoD schools currently located on [Give Names of Military Bases] to the adjacent LEAs. Our data collection interests include: (1) positions of State and local education officials regarding responsibilities to educate military-connected students, particularly those residing on military installations; and (2) your views on the financial, construction, and other support needed to facilitate transfer of these schools.

This study is being conducted for the Department of Defense Education activity as mandated by Section 361 of the 1995 National Defense Authorization Act, and is authorized under Sections 136 and 2358 of 10 United States Code.

Study results will be used in reports provided to the Secretaries of Defense and Education, the Secretaries of each Military Service, and the United States Congress. Some findings may be published by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in professional journals, or reported in manuscripts presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. In no case will individual respondents be identified.

Providing information in this interview is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, your participation is encouraged so that the data will be complete and representative. You may ask to skip any question with which you are not comfortable, and you can stop the discussion at any time.

This survey is estimated to take less than 20 minutes of your time. This may vary as some interviews will take more time and some will take less time. You may send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the length, to the Federal government. Would you like the address of the government office you may contact?

YES -----	1	(SEE BELOW)
NO-----	2	(GO TO Q. 1)

IF RESPONDENT DESIRES ADDRESS, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING:
--

Washington Headquarters Services
Defense Information Operations and Reports
1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204
Arlington, Virginia 22202-4303

1. What is your State's position on who is responsible for educating military-connected students who live on military installations?
2. Is there a legal and/or financial basis for this position?
3. What problems, if any, has your State experienced as a result of providing public education for military-connected students? (PROBE: Financial problems, political problems, legal, logistical, educational, etc.)
4. The following questions ask about the potential transfer of DoD schools at [INSERT NAME OF BASES] to local education agencies (LEAs) within your State. We are interested in knowing the conditions under which a transfer could occur, and what financial and other concerns would arise at the State level if such a transfer were to occur.

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IN STATES WITH MORE THAN ONE DDESS SYSTEM, THERE MAY BE PROBLEMS THAT ARE UNIQUE TO EACH LOCATION. PROBE WHERE NECESSARY ON GENERALITY OR SPECIFICITY OF EACH PROBLEM. IF THE RESPONDENT CITES A PROBLEM, PROBE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESOLUTION, OR AT LEAST ATTEMPT TO IDENTIFY THE KEY PLAYERS AND DECISION MAKERS.

5. If these schools became part of neighboring LEAs within your State, would the State contribute its share of the per pupil expenditure to whichever LEAs took responsibility for educating these students?
6. Would the State contribute any additional money to the LEAs to offset the lower tax revenues available to these LEAs?
7. Would you require State or local ownership of the existing school facilities on the military installation?
8. Does your State have any legal requirements that would affect the transfer of base school facilities to LEAs (e.g., fee simple title requirement)?
9. Do you anticipate any difficulty on the part of the State in meeting these requirements?
10. Do you anticipate any difficulty on the part of the Federal Government (i.e., the military installation) in meeting these requirements? What are your recommendations to overcome these difficulties?
11. Does your State have any requirements or other concerns regarding the construction, renovation, or maintenance of school facilities that would affect the transfer?
12. If difficulties are cited: What are your recommendations to overcome these difficulties? (PROBE: key players, decision makers, levels)
13. Please provide what you see as significant barriers to transferring the Department of Defense schools to an LEA in each of the following major areas:

INTERVIEWER NOTE: PROBE FOR ISSUES THAT WOULD APPLY GENERALLY AND THOSE THAT WOULD APPLY TO SPECIFIC LOCATIONS. SEEK RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOLUTIONS - RESPONSIBILITIES AND LEVELS
--

- Transportation and Busing
- Employee salaries and benefits
- Local jurisdiction
- Representation of military parents on local school boards
- Local education agency financial status after a transfer

14. Are there any other issues that your State education agency would want to have resolved before a transfer could occur? If so, what would need to be done to resolve these issues?

In-Person Interview Protocol For Neighboring LEA Superintendents

Background on LEA

1. Collect written information on, or ask about:
 - Enrollments, demographics, recent population trends
 - Adequacy of current school staffing and facilities (e.g., over-crowded?)
 - Number of schools at each level (elementary, middle, high school)
 - Adequacy of funding; current receipt of Impact Aid funds
 - Court-ordered busing
1. How would you characterize local community support for education?
2. How would you characterize relations between the local community and the base? (positive, negative; extensive, limited) Between the two school systems?

Educating Military Students

4. What is your LEA's position on who is responsible for educating military-connected students who live on military installations? What is the LEA's position on its responsibility for educating these students? Is there a legal and/or financial basis for this position?
5. Currently, what responsibilities does your LEA have for educating military-connected students? (Educating only off-base, both on- and off-base; about how many or what percentage of LEA enrollments)
6. If educating military students: What problems, if any, has your LEA experienced as a result of providing public education for military-connected students? (Financial problems, political, legal, logistical, educational, etc.)

Transfer Issue

7. What is your LEA's position on a transfer of the existing DoD schools at [INSERT NAME OF MILITARY INSTALLATION] to your LEA?
8. A potential transfer raises a variety of issues and problems that would need to be resolved before the transfer could occur. I'd like to ask you specifically about some of the most common issues, and about how you think these issues could be resolved. Are there any issues or problems that would have to be resolved concerning:
 - a) [If base housing crosses State, county or LEA lines:] Local jurisdiction? (Would LEA take responsibility for all base students, or give responsibility--including funding--to another LEA? Would State intervention, law be necessary?) Ways to resolve the issue?
 - b) Maintaining per pupil expenditures? (Would Impact Aid fully compensate LEA for cost of educating on-base students? Would State funding increase?) Ways to resolve?

- c) The transfer of base facilities to the LEA? (Would LEA need existing or new facilities? Would LEA need fee simple title? Any construction or renovation needs? Any other legal restrictions on property transfer?) Ways to resolve?
 - d) Transportation and busing of students? (Would LEA have to purchase buses? Would students need to be bused on or off base, and would this create any potential problems? Would base students be bused in order to meet court-ordered busing requirements or to solve capacity problems?) Ways to resolve?
 - e) Employee salaries and benefits? (Could all existing staff be hired? Would staff be hired at current salary levels? Could staff buy into existing retirement system? Ways to resolve?
 - f) Representation of base parents? (Could they vote in local school board elections? Could they run for the school board? If not, could they have non-voting representation?) Ways to resolve?
9. What other issues or problems would have to be resolved prior to a potential transfer? How could these be resolved?
10. If respondent is familiar with the RAND Report or Note, ask if findings from those publications are still valid, or if any conditions have changed since the publication of those reports.

In-Person Interview Protocol For DDESS Superintendents

Background On DDESS Schools

1. Collect written information on, or ask about:
 - Enrollments, demographics, recent trends
 - Adequacy of current staff and facilities
 - Number of schools at each level
1. What is the current distribution of military students among the DoD schools, LEAs, and (if known) local private schools?
2. How would you characterize on-base community support for education?
3. How would you characterize relations between the local community and the base? (positive, negative, extensive, limited) Between the two school systems?
4. How do funding levels differ between the DoD schools on base and schools in the local community? Are there differences between these school systems in terms of:
 - Student-teacher ratios
 - Support staffing (counselors, aides, etc.)
 - Staff training opportunities
 - Educational supplies and equipment
 - Programs for students with special needs
 - Extra-curricular offerings
1. What (else) does your DoD school system offer that the local school system cannot offer? What does the local school system offer that your system cannot?

Transfer Issue

7. From your point of view, what issues or problems would arise if the DoD schools on this base were transferred to the LEA(s)? How could these be resolved?
8. Probes:
 - Maintaining neighborhood schools
 - Understanding particular needs of military students
 - Loss of staff or programs
 - Employee salaries and benefits
 - Link to other base services or programs
 - Parental input and governance

In-Person Interview Protocol for Base Commanders or Representatives

Background

1. What is the relationship in general between the military base and the local community?
2. What interactions does the base have with the local school systems?
3. What is your impression of the DoD schools on this military installation? Do these schools appear to be appropriately resourced? (Yes or no: Supporting evidence?)

Transfer Issue

1. What is your position on a transfer of the DoD schools to local education agencies?
2. From your point of view, what concerns or requirements would need to be addressed before a transfer could occur?
3. Would busing students off-base pose any problems for you? Busing students on base?
4. Would giving the local school systems full control of the current on-base school property pose any problems?
5. In general, under what conditions would a transfer be acceptable to you? What could the Federal government do to make a transfer more acceptable?

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVEY

OF PARENTS' OPINIONS

ON LOCAL SCHOOLS



RCS: DD-P&R(OT)1982
Exp. 11/8/1996

Department of Defense

Survey of Parents' Opinions on Local Schools



Photos: Courtesy of U.S. Department of Education

DMDC Survey No. 95003

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

PRIVACY NOTICE

In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-579), this notice informs you of the purpose of the survey and how the findings will be used. Please read it carefully.

AUTHORITY: 10 United States Code, Sections 136 and 2358.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Information collected in this survey will be used to report opinions of military parents concerning the quality of education in local public school systems that enroll a high proportion of students (greater than 30%) who are military dependents. This information will be used in the development of policies to ensure that military dependents receive an appropriate education. Reports will be provided to Congress, the Secretaries of Defense and Education, and each Military Service. Some findings may be published by the Defense Manpower Data Center or professional journals, or reported in manuscripts presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. In no case will the data for identifiable individuals be reported.

ROUTINE USES: None.

DISCLOSURE: Providing information on this survey is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, your participation is encouraged so that the data will be complete and representative. Your questionnaire will be treated as confidential. Identifying information will be used only by persons engaged in, and for purposes of, the survey. Only group statistics will be reported.

ABOUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is part of a larger study the Department of Defense is conducting to collect information concerning the adequacy of funding among schools that are highly affected by a military presence. Funding data are also being collected from relevant state and local public education officials. This questionnaire asks for your opinions on the quality of education provided by the public schools your children attend; this is one important indicator of the extent to which a school is properly funded.

WHY ME?

You have been selected at random to be part of a sample of people who represent all military parents with children enrolled in the 95 local public school systems (districts) in which over 30 percent of enrolled students are military or other federal dependents. There are about 200,000 military parents with children enrolled in these local school districts. Enough of these parents are being asked to complete this survey so that valid conclusions can be made about the views of military parents from each school district.


TO WHICH CHILDREN AND SCHOOLS DOES THIS SURVEY APPLY? WHO SHOULD COMPLETE THE SURVEY?

This survey applies to children currently attending any of the local public school districts listed on the back cover of this survey, or children who previously attended one of these districts in school year 1995–96. Please turn to the back cover now, and mark the public school district that your children currently attend (or previously attended in school year 1995–96). **Answer the survey questions for the schools in the marked district, even if your children no longer attend school in that district.** If you have more than one child who attends (or attended) schools in the marked district, please answer the questions for the child whose birthday is next. The survey should be completed by the parent or guardian most knowledgeable about your child's school.

REMEMBER: Answer these questions for the public school district you marked on the back cover, and for the child whose birthday is next.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- Use a No. 2 pencil only.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the response circles.
- Do not make any marks outside the response circles.
- If you change your mind, erase old marks completely.
- Do not use ink, ballpoint, or felt tip pens.



WRONG MARKS



RIGHT MARK



ANSWER THE QUESTIONS FOR SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT YOU MARKED ON THE BACK COVER, AND FOR YOUR CHILD WITH THE NEXT BIRTHDAY.

- 1. Please read each of the following statements and fill the circle that best represents your opinion about your child's school.**

Fill one circle on each line.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. This school's academic program is challenging and rigorous.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. This school is well-equipped; students have the necessary books and materials, access to computers, science labs, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. The quality of instruction at this school is good.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. This school provides additional help to students who have trouble learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. This school is providing my child with a good education.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. This school is not underfunded.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. This school has a good reputation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Students at this school are treated fairly, regardless of their race, sex, or social class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 2. Students are often given grades A, B, C, D, or F to denote the quality of their work. Suppose your child's school was graded in the same way. For each item below, indicate which of the following grades best represents your view of the quality of the education your child is receiving at this school.**

A = Excellent B = Good C = Satisfactory D = Poor F = Fail NA = Not applicable or no information

Fill one circle on each line.

	A	B	C	D	F	NA
a. Reading/English/language arts program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Mathematics program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Science program (e.g., quality of instruction, course offerings)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Overall academic program (e.g., variety of courses, challenging material)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Support services provided by the school (testing and screening, individual counseling, assistance with course selection, and college and career guidance)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Special education programs (programs for disabled students)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Overall quality of the school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

3. Suppose all the public schools in the U.S. as a whole were graded in the same way (grades of A, B, C, D, or F). For each item below, indicate which of the following grades best represents your view of the quality of education in public schools in the U.S. as a whole.

A = Excellent B = Good C = Satisfactory D = Poor F = Fail NA = Not applicable or no information

Fill one circle on each line.

	A	B	C	D	F	NA
a. Overall academic program (e.g., variety of courses, challenging material)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Support services provided by the school (e.g., counseling, testing and screening)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Special education programs (programs for disabled students)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Overall quality of the public schools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. To what extent do you feel that you have an adequate voice in decisions about the educational programs at your child's school? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Very large extent
☐ Large extent
☐ Moderate extent
☐ Small extent
☐ Not at all

The following background information is needed to describe military families who participate in this survey. Answer questions 5–11 for your child (with the next birthday) who attends or attended school in the public school district marked on the back cover.

5. In what grade is your child (with the next birthday) who attends school in the local public school district? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Pre-Kindergarten ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 8 ☐ 11
☐ Kindergarten ☐ 3 ☐ 6 ☐ 9 ☐ 12
☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 7 ☐ 10

6. Does this child attend the closest public school that enrolls that grade level? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Yes
☐ No; my child is bused to a more distant school because of overcrowding in the schools
☐ No; my child is bused to a more distant school for desegregation reasons
☐ No; my child attends a more distant school for other reasons

7. Is the public school this child attends located on a military installation?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

8. How long has this child attended school in the local public school district? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Less than 1 year
- ☐ At least 1 year but not 2 years
- ☐ At least 2 years but not 3 years
- ☐ At least 3 years but not 4 years
- ☐ 4 years or more

9. Is this child of Spanish/Hispanic origin or descent? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ No (not Spanish/Hispanic)
- ☐ Yes (Mexican, Mexican-Amer., Chicano)
- ☐ Yes (Puerto Rican)
- ☐ Yes (Cuban)
- ☐ Yes (other Spanish/Hispanic)

10. What race do you consider this child to be? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ White
- ☐ Black or African-Amer.
- ☐ American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Other race (specify)

11. Is this child physically, emotionally, or learning disabled?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

12. How many children do you have who currently attend (or attended in 1995–96) school in the local public school district? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ 1 child
- ☐ 2 children
- ☐ 3 children
- ☐ 4 or more children

13. In how many public school districts have your children attended school? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ 1 public school district
- ☐ 2 public school districts
- ☐ 3 public school districts
- ☐ 4 public school districts
- ☐ 5 or more public school districts

14. What is the military service of your children's sponsor? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Army
☐ Navy
☐ Air Force
☐ Marine Corps
☐ Coast Guard
☐ My children's sponsor is not a military service member

15. What is the present rank/pay grade of your children's sponsor? (Mark only one; if both parents/guardians are military service members, mark the higher rank/pay grade.)

- ☐ Enlisted (E1–E4)
☐ Enlisted (E5–E6)
☐ Enlisted (E7–E9)
☐ Warrant Officer (W1–W3)
☐ Warrant Officer (W4 and above)
☐ Commissioned Officer (O1–O3)
☐ Commissioned Officer (O4 and above)
☐ My children's sponsor is not a military service member

16. Does your family currently live in government quarters/housing?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

17. During the current posting to this military installation, did you consider sending any of your children to private schools? (Mark only one.)

- ☐ Yes; one or more of my children currently attend private school
☐ Yes; one or more of my children used to attend private school, but now attend a public or Department of Defense school
☐ Yes; private school was considered, but not chosen
☐ No; private school was not considered

18. Do you have any children currently attending a Department of Defense Domestic Dependent School located on the military installations listed below? (Mark all that apply.)

- ☐ I have no children currently attending a Department of Defense Domestic Dependent School.

Army

- ☐ Fort Benning
☐ Fort Bragg
☐ Fort Campbell
☐ Fort Jackson
☐ Fort Knox
☐ Fort McClellan
☐ Fort Rucker
☐ Fort Stewart
☐ U.S. Military Academy, West Point

Navy

- ☐ Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center

Marine Corps

- ☐ Camp Lejeune
☐ Laurel Bay Marine Corps Base
☐ Quantico Marine Corps Base

Air Force

- ☐ Maxwell Air Force Base
☐ Robins Air Force Base

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

4

1

Mark **one** local public school district that your children attended since September 1995. If your children have attended more than one district, mark the district attended as of September 1995 by your child who has the next birthday. If your children have not attended any of these districts since September 1995, please note this on the front cover of the survey and return it unanswered.

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| AL | <input type="radio"/> Daleville City School System (Daleville) | NE | <input type="radio"/> Bellevue Public Schools (Bellevue) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Enterprise City School System (Enterprise) | NV | <input type="radio"/> Mineral County School District (Hawthorne) |
| AK | <input type="radio"/> Anchorage School District (Anchorage) | NJ | <input type="radio"/> Cape May City School District (Cape May) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Delta-Greely School District (Delta Junction) | | <input type="radio"/> Eatontown School District (Eatontown) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Fairbanks School District (Fairbanks) | | <input type="radio"/> Monmouth Regional High School District (Eatontown) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Kodiak School District (Kodiak) | | <input type="radio"/> Northern Burlington County School District (Columbus) |
| AZ | <input type="radio"/> Fort Huachuca School District (Fort Huachuca) | | <input type="radio"/> North Hanover Township School District (Wrightstown) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Palominas Elementary School District #49 (Hereford) | NM | <input type="radio"/> Alamogordo Municipal School District #1 (Alamogordo) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Vista Unified School District (Sierra Vista) | NY | <input type="radio"/> Indian River Central School District (Philadelphia) |
| CA | <input type="radio"/> Central Unified School District (Lemoore) | NC | <input type="radio"/> Craven County School District (New Bern) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Coronado Unified School District (Coronado) | | <input type="radio"/> Cumberland County School District (Fayetteville) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Fallbrook Union Elementary School District (Fallbrook) | | <input type="radio"/> Onslow County School District (Jacksonville) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Fort Sage Unified School District (Herlong) | ND | <input type="radio"/> Emerado School District #127 (Emerado) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Lemoore Union High School District (Lemoore) | | <input type="radio"/> Glenburn School District #26 (Glenburn) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (Monterey) | | <input type="radio"/> Grand Forks AFB School District #140 (Grand Forks) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Muroc Joint Unified School District (North Edwards) | | <input type="radio"/> Larimore School District #44 (Larimore) |
| | <input type="radio"/> San Antonio Union School District (Lockwood) | | <input type="radio"/> Minot AFB School District #160 (Minot) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Sands Unified School District (Ridgecrest) | OH | <input type="radio"/> Beavercreek Local School District (Beavercreek) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Silver Valley Unified School District (Yermo) | | <input type="radio"/> Fairborn City School District (Fairborn) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Travis Unified School District (Fairfield) | | <input type="radio"/> Mad River Local School District (Dayton) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Two Rock Union School District (Petaluma) | OK | <input type="radio"/> Altus School District (Altus) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Wheatland School District (Wheatland) | | <input type="radio"/> Bishop Elementary School District (Lawton) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Wheatland Union High School District (Wheatland) | | <input type="radio"/> Lawton School District (Lawton) |
| CO | <input type="radio"/> El Paso County School District #3 (Colorado Springs) | RI | <input type="radio"/> Middletown School District (Middletown) |
| | <input type="radio"/> El Paso County School District #8 (Fountain) | SD | <input type="radio"/> Douglas School District #51-1 (Box Elder) |
| CT | <input type="radio"/> Groton School District (Groton) | TN | <input type="radio"/> Clarksville-Montgomery County School District (Clarksville) |
| FL | <input type="radio"/> Okaloosa County School District (Fort Walton Beach) | TX | <input type="radio"/> Burkburnett Independent School District (Burkburnett) |
| GA | <input type="radio"/> Camden County School District (Kingsland) | | <input type="radio"/> Copperas Cove Independent School District (Copperas Cove) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Houston County School District (Perry) | | <input type="radio"/> Fort Sam Houston Independent School District (San Antonio) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Liberty County School District (Hinesville) | | <input type="radio"/> Judson Independent School District (Converse) |
| HI | <input type="radio"/> Hawaii Central School District (Honolulu) | | <input type="radio"/> Killeen Independent School District (Killeen) |
| ID | <input type="radio"/> Mountain Home School District #193 (Mountain Home) | | <input type="radio"/> Lackland Independent School District (San Antonio) |
| IL | <input type="radio"/> Belle Valley School District #119 (Belleville) | | <input type="radio"/> New Boston Independent School District (New Boston) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Mascoutah Community Unit School District #19 (Mascoutah) | | <input type="radio"/> Randolph Field Independent School District (Universal City) |
| | <input type="radio"/> North Chicago School District #187 (North Chicago) | UT | <input type="radio"/> Tooele County School District (Tooele) |
| | <input type="radio"/> O'Fallon Elementary School District #90 (O'Fallon) | VA | <input type="radio"/> Prince George County School District (Prince George) |
| | <input type="radio"/> O'Fallon Township High School District #203 (O'Fallon) | | <input type="radio"/> Virginia Beach City School District (Virginia Beach) |
| IN | <input type="radio"/> Loogootee Community School Corporation (Loogootee) | | <input type="radio"/> York County School District (Yorktown) |
| KS | <input type="radio"/> Fort Leavenworth Unified School District (Fort Leavenworth) | WA | <input type="radio"/> Bremerton County School District #100 (Bremerton) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Geary County Unified School District #475 (Junction City) | | <input type="radio"/> Central Kitsap School District #401 (Silverdale) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Lansing Unified School District #469 (Lansing) | | <input type="radio"/> Clover Park School District #400 (Tacoma) |
| LA | <input type="radio"/> Vernon Parish (Leesville) | | <input type="radio"/> Medical Lake School District #326 (Medical Lake) |
| ME | <input type="radio"/> Caswell Plantation School District (Caswell Plantation) | | <input type="radio"/> North Mason School District #403 (Belfair) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Kittery School District (Kittery) | | <input type="radio"/> Oak Harbor School District #201 (Oak Harbor) |
| | <input type="radio"/> Winter Harbor School District (East Sullivan) | | <input type="radio"/> South Kitsap School District #402 (Port Orchard) |
| MA | <input type="radio"/> Ayer School Community (Ayer) | | |
| MS | <input type="radio"/> Biloxi Public School District (Biloxi) | | |
| MO | <input type="radio"/> Knob Noster R-VIII School District (Knob Noster) | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Plato R-V School District (Plato) | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Waynesville R-VI School District (Waynesville) | | |

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



SERIAL #

APPENDIX E

LEA STATE AND LOCAL

INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Telephone Protocol for Local Education Agency Officials of Impact Aid LEAs

My name is [INTERVIEWER]. I am calling from Westat Incorporated on behalf of the U.S. Department of Defense Education Activity. We are conducting a study to collect information from the State and local education officials who have school districts with military-connected student populations of over 30 percent. Our data collection interests include: (1) levels of financial support provided by DoD and other Federal agencies; (2) positions of State and local education officials regarding responsibilities to educate military-connected students; and (3) information on funding sources and comparison with school districts that do not have a large percentage of military-connected students.

This study is being conducted for the Department of Defense Education activity as mandated by Section 361 of the 1995 National Defense Authorization Act, and is authorized under Sections 136 and 2358 of 10 United States Code.

Study results will be used in reports provided to the Secretaries of Defense and Education, the Secretaries of each Military service, and the United States Congress. Some findings may be published by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in professional journals, or reported in manuscripts presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. In no case will individual respondents be identified.

Providing information in this interview is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, your participation is encouraged so that the data will be complete and representative. You may ask to skip any question with which you are not comfortable, and you can stop the discussion at any time.

This survey is estimated to take less than 20 minutes of your time. This may vary as some interviews will take more time and some will take less time. You may send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the length, to the Federal government. Would you like the address of the government office you may contact?

YES -----	1	(SEE BELOW)
NO-----	2	(GO TO Q. 1)

IF RESPONDENT DESIRES ADDRESS, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING:
--

Washington Headquarters Services
Defense Information Operations and Reports
1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204
Arlington, Virginia 22202-4303

1. What is the total student enrollment for school year 1995-96?
2. What grades does this enrollment cover?
3. What is your total 1995-96 Federal Enrollment?

INTERVIEWER NOTE: OBTAIN SEPARATE FIGURES FOR MILITARY A's, MILITARY B's, AND THOSE FEDERAL CIVILIANS ELIGIBLE TO BE COUNTED UNDER CURRENT IMPACT AID LAW. THIS SHOULD TOTAL TO TOTAL FEDERAL ENROLLMENT.

4. What is the total amount of your current school year 1995-96 General Fund Budget?
5. What are your major General Fund Revenue sources (e.g., State government, Federal government, Local Revenues)?
6. What percent does each revenue source contribute to your General Fund Budget?
7. What are your major sources of local revenue? (e.g., local property tax)
8. Are there any restrictions on the use of certain funds based on their source? (PROBE: some State supplied funds can only be used for certain things such as support of State education goals, or capital outlays for construction).
9. What is your 1995-96 General Fund Per Pupil Expenditure (PPE)?
10. How does this PPE compare to the State average?
11. How does this PPE compare to "comparable" (e.g., same size, location) LEAs in your State?
12. What is the current "assessed value" behind each student?
13. What are your 1995-96 revenue sources for Capital Outlays and Construction?
14. In the past five years, have you had to make expenditures out of your General Fund to cover maintenance, repair, or construction?
15. How often have you had to do this?
16. What is the overall funding outlook for your district? (getting better, worse, relatively stable)
17. Have there been any major changes in your LEA's funding sources or status in the past five years?
IF YES, explain:
18. What is your LEA's position on who is responsible for educating military-connected students who live on military installations (Type A military students)?
19. What is your LEA's position on who is responsible for educating military-connected students who live in the local community (Type B military students)?

IF THE LEA HAS NO POSITION IN RESPONSE TO 18 OR 19 SKIP TO 21.

20. Is there a legal and/or financial basis for this position?
21. What problems, if any, has your LEA experienced as a result of providing public education for military-connected students? (PROBE: financial problems, political problems, legal, logistical, educational, etc.)
22. Does your LEA's State funding allocation take into account Federal Impact Aid funding?

YES ----- 1 (GO TO Q.23.)
NO----- 2 (GO TO Q.24.)
DON'T KNOW ----- 3 (GO TO Q.24.)

23. IF YES: how?
24. Does your State contribute any additional money to your LEA because it is Federally impacted that other non-Federally impacted LEAs in your State do not receive?

YES ----- 1 (GO TO Q.25.)
NO----- 2 (GO TO Q.26.)
DON'T KNOW ----- 3 (GO TO Q.26.)

25. IF YES: In what amount?

Are there any restrictions on these funds?

How are these funds generally used?

How is this money allocated to your LEA? (PROBE: based on Type A students, Type B, other Federally connected students, etc?)

How long has your LEA been receiving these additional funds?

Do you consider this to be a reliable source of funding for the future?

YES ----- 1
NO----- 2
DON'T KNOW ----- 3

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED, THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO IMPACT AID FUNDING FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. DO NOT INCLUDE SUPPLEMENTAL IMPACT AID FUNDING PROVIDED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE UNLESS THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY ASKS ABOUT THOSE FUNDS.

26. How reliable a funding source has the Impact Aid program been?

27. How have your Impact Aid allocations changed in the past five years?

28. Do you consider Impact Aid to be a reliable source of funding for the future?

YES -----	1
NO-----	2
DON'T KNOW -----	3

29. If Impact Aid has been unreliable or is considered unreliable for the future: How did you/will you deal with this lack of reliability?

30. How are Impact Aid funds generally used?

31. Does your LEA include anticipated Impact Aid funds in its annual budget proposal?

YES -----	1	
NO-----	2	Why are these funds not included?
DON'T KNOW -----	3	

32. To what extent does the Impact Aid received by your LEA offset the cost of educating the military-connected students in your LEA? (PROBE: Type A vs. Type B students)

33. Has your LEA experienced any problems because of the timing of the receipt of Impact Aid?

34. Has your LEA experienced any problems because of fluctuations in Impact Aid allocations?

35. Prior to 1995-96, did your LEA receive supplemental Impact Aid funds from the **U.S. Department of Defense**?

YES -----	1	(GO TO Q.36.)
NO-----	2	(END)
DON'T KNOW -----	3	(END)

36. IF YES: How did those funds compare to the Impact Aid funds you received from the U.S. Department of Education? (PROBE: in amounts, flexibility, timing, other ways)?

37. How were these funds used?

Telephone Protocol for State Education Agency Officials with Impact Aid LEAs

My name is [INTERVIEWER]. I am calling from Westat Incorporated on behalf of the U.S. Department of Defense Education Activity. We are conducting a study to collect information from State and local education officials who have school districts with military-connected student populations of over 30 percent. Our data collecting interests include: (1) levels of financial support provided by DoD and other Federal agencies; (2) positions of State and local education officials regarding responsibilities to educate military-connected students; and (3) information on funding sources and comparison with school districts that do not have a large percentage of military-connected students.

This study is being conducted for the Department of Defense Education Activity as mandated by Section 361 of the 1995 National Defense Authorization Act, and is authorized under Sections 136 and 2358 of 10 United States Code.

Study results will be used in reports provided to the Secretaries of Defense and Education, the Secretaries of each Military service, and the United States Congress. Some findings may be published by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in professional journals, or reported in manuscripts presented at conferences, symposia, and scientific meetings. In no case will individual respondents be identified.

Providing information in this interview is voluntary. There is no penalty if you choose not to respond. However, your participation is encouraged so that the data will be complete and representative. You may ask to skip any question with which you are not comfortable, and you can stop the discussion at any time.

This survey is estimated to take less than 15 minutes of your time. This may vary as some interviews will take more time and some will take less time. You may send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the length, to the Federal Government. Would you like the address of the government office you may contact?

IF RESPONDENT DESIRES ADDRESS, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING:
--

Washington Headquarters Services
Defense Information Operations and Reports
1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204
Arlington, Virginia 22202-4303

1. What is the State total 1995-96 enrollment in grades Kindergarten through 12?
2. What is the current number of LEAs in the State?
3. What is the 1995-96 total State budget for elementary and secondary education?
4. How has this budget changed in the past five years?
5. What are the major sources of revenue that comprise the 1995-96 State elementary and secondary education budget? (INTERVIEWER NOTE: OBTAIN INFORMATION ON THE TOTAL BUDGET AMOUNT AND THE PERCENT OF THIS TOTAL EACH REVENUE SOURCE COMPRISES.)
6. Does the State provide funds to LEAs?

YES -----	1	
NO-----	2	(SKIP TO 9B)
DON'T KNOW -----	3	(SKIP TO 9B)

7. Are these funds provided as a general allocation or are they earmarked for specific programs?

General Allocations-----	1	
Specific Programs-----	2	LIST PROGRAMS & AMOUNTS

INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF FUNDS ARE EARMARKED FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS, TRY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON AMOUNTS AND WHAT THESE SPECIFIC PROGRAMS ARE.

8. What procedures are used to allocate funds to LEAs (e.g., formula)?
- 9A. What was the Per Pupil Allocation last year?
- 9B. What is the State Per Pupil Expenditure average?
10. What is the highest PPE in the State? (OBTAIN AMOUNT AND NAME OF LEA)
11. What is the lowest? (OBTAIN AMOUNT AND NAME OF LEA)
12. What is your State's position on who is responsible for educating military-connected students who live on military installations (Type A military students)?
13. What is your State's position on who is responsible for educating military-connected students who live in the local community (Type B military students)?

IF THE STATE HAS NO POSITION IN RESPONSE TO 12 OR 13 SKIP TO 15.

14. Is there a legal and/or financial basis for these positions?
15. What problems, if any, has your State experienced as a result of providing public education for military-connected students? (PROBE: Financial problems, political problems, legal, logistical,

educational, etc.)

16. Are Federal Impact Aid payments taken into account when determining funding allocations to LEAs?
If so, how?

17. Does your State contribute any additional money to LEAs because they are Federally impacted that other (non-Federally impacted) LEAs in your State do not receive?

YES ----- 1 (GO TO Q.18)
NO----- 2 (GO TO Q.19)

18. IF YES:

What is the total amount contributed for this purpose?

How many LEAs receive this additional funding?

How is this funding allocated? (PROBE: Based on Type A students, Type B, other Federally-connected students, etc?)

How long has your State been providing these additional funds?

Are there any restrictions on how these funds are used?

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED, THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO IMPACT AID FUNDING FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. DO NOT INCLUDE SUPPLEMENTAL IMPACT AID FUNDING PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE UNLESS THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY ASKS ABOUT THOSE FUNDS.

19. Has the Impact Aid program been a reliable funding source for LEAs in your State?

YES ----- 1
NO----- 2
DON'T KNOW ----- 3

20. Do you consider Impact Aid to be a reliable source of funding for the future?

YES ----- 1 (GO TO Q.22)
NO----- 2 (GO TO Q.21)
DON'T KNOW ----- 3 (GO TO Q.22)

21. If Impact Aid has been unreliable or is considered unreliable for the future: Does or will your State provide additional funds to compensate for this lack of reliability?

YES ----- 1
NO----- 2
DON'T KNOW ----- 3

22. To what extent do you believe Impact Aid funding offsets the cost of educating military-connected students within your State?

23. Prior to 1995-96, did LEAs in your State receive supplemental Impact Aid funds from the **Department of Defense**?

YES ----- 1 (GO TO Q.24.)

NO----- 2 (END)

DON'T KNOW ----- 3 (END)

24. IF YES: Do you know how those funds compare to the Impact Aid funds LEAs received from the Department of Education (PROBE: in amounts, flexibility, timing, other ways)?

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL CHAPTER TABLES

Table F.1.

Local Public School Systems Included in Impact Aid Portion of Study

AL	Daleville City School System (Daleville) Enterprise City School System (Enterprise)	MO	Knob Noster R-VIII School District (Knob Noster) Plato R-V School District (Plato) Waynesville R-VI School District (Waynesville)
AK	Anchorage School District (Anchorage) Delta-Greely School District (Delta Junction) Fairbanks School District (Fairbanks) Kodiak School District (Kodiak)	NE	Bellevue Public Schools (Bellevue)
AZ	Fort Huachuca School District (Fort Huachuca) Palominas Elementary School District #49 (Hereford) Sierra Vista Unified School District (Sierra Vista)	NV	Mineral County School District (Hawthorne)
CA	Central Unified School District (Lemoore) Coronado Unified School District (Coronado) Fallbrook Union Elementary School District (Fallbrook) Fort Sage Unified School District (Herlong) Lemoore Union High School District (Lemoore) Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (Monterey) Muroc Joint Unified School District (North Edwards) San Antonio Union School District (Lockwood) Sierra Sands Unified School District (Ridgecrest) Silver Valley Unified School District (Yermo) Travis Unified School District (Fairfield) Two Rock Union School District (Petaluma) Wheatland School District (Wheatland) Wheatland Union High School District (Wheatland)	NJ	Cape May City School District (Cape May) Eatontown School District (Eatontown) Monmouth Regional High School District (Eatontown) Northern Burlington County School District (Columbus) North Hanover Township School District (Wrightstown)
CO	El Paso County School District #3 (Colorado Springs) El Paso County School District #8 (Fountain)	NM	Alamogordo Municipal School District #1 (Alamogordo)
CT	Groton School District (Groton)	NY	Indian River Central School District (Philadelphia)
FL	Okaloosa County School District (Fort Walton Beach)	NC	Craven County School District (New Bern) Cumberland County School District (Fayetteville) Onslow County School District (Jacksonville)
GA	Camden County School District (Kingsland) Houston County School District (Perry) Liberty County School District (Hinesville)	ND	Emerado School District #127 (Emerado) Glenburn School District #26 (Glenburn) Grand Forks AFB School District #140 (Grand Forks) Larimore School District #44 (Larimore) Minot AFB School District #160 (Minot)
HI	Hawaii Central School District (Honolulu)	OH	Beavercreek Local School District (Beavercreek) Fairborn City School District (Fairborn) Mad River Local School District (Dayton)
ID	Mountain Home School District #193 (Mountain Home)	OK	Altus School District (Altus) Bishop Elementary School District (Lawton) Lawton School District (Lawton)
IL	Belle Valley School District #119 (Belleville) Mascoutah Community Unit School District #19 (Mascoutah) North Chicago School District #187 (North Chicago) O'Fallon Elementary School District #90 (O'Fallon) O'Fallon Township High School District #203 (O'Fallon)	RI	Middletown School District (Middletown)
IN	Loogootee Community School Corporation (Loogootee)	SD	Douglas School District #51-1 (Box Elder)
KS	Fort Leavenworth Unified School District (Fort Leavenworth) Geary County Unified School District #475 (Junction City) Lansing Unified School District #469 (Lansing)	TN	Clarksville-Montgomery County School District (Clarksville)
LA	Vernon Parish (Leesville)	TX	Burkburnett Independent School District (Burkburnett) Copperas Cove Independent School District (Copperas Cove) Fort Sam Houston Independent School District (San Antonio) Judson Independent School District (Converse) Killeen Independent School District (Killeen) Lackland Independent School District (San Antonio) New Boston Independent School District (New Boston) Randolph Field Independent School District (Universal City)
ME	Kittery School District (Kittery) Winter Harbor School District (East Sullivan)	UT	Tooele County School District (Tooele)
MA	Ayer School Community (Ayer)	VA	Prince George County School District (Prince George) Virginia Beach City School District (Virginia Beach) York County School District (Yorktown)
MS	Biloxi Public School District (Biloxi)	WA	Bremerton County School District #100 (Bremerton) Central Kitsap School District #401 (Silverdale) Clover Park School District #400 (Tacoma) Medical Lake School District #326 (Medical Lake) Oak Harbor School District #201 (Oak Harbor) South Kitsap School District # 402 (Port Orchard)

Table F.2.

DDESS Parents' Agreement with Positive Characterizations of the DDESS School, by Parent Group

Characterization of the DDESS School	Percent Who Agree or Strongly Agree with Characterization															
	Paygrade Group					Level of School			Experience							
	Commis- sioned Officers		Senior Enlisted and Warrant Officers		Junior Enlisted		Elemen- tary		Middle		High		With Public School Experi- ence		Without Public School Experi- ence	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
This school provides a safe, well-disciplined environment for learning.	96	±1.0	92	±1.2	93	±0.8	94	±0.6	90	±2.5	89	±2.4	93	±0.6	94	±1.0
This school encourages parents to become involved with their children's learning.	94	±1.0	91	±1.2	93	±0.8	94	±0.6	88	±2.2	86	±1.8	92	±0.6	95	±1.0
This school is providing my child with a good education.	93	±1.2	90	±1.2	89	±0.8	91	±0.6	86	±2.0	88	±2.0	89	±0.8	92	±1.0
The quality of instruction at this school is good.	93	±1.2	90	±1.2	89	±1.0	91	±0.8	87	±2.7	87	±2.2	89	±0.8	92	±1.0
This school is well-equipped; students have the necessary books and materials, access to com- puters, science labs, etc.	91	±1.2	89	±1.2	88	±0.8	89	±0.6	88	±2.2	88	±2.0	89	±0.6	89	±1.2
Students at this school are treated fairly, regardless of their race, sex, or social class.	92	±1.2	85	±1.4	84	±1.2	87	±0.8	81	±2.7	79	±2.5	85	±1.0	88	±1.4
This school is responsive to the problems and needs of military students.	92	±1.2	86	±1.4	83	±1.2	86	±0.8	83	±2.2	82	±1.8	85	±1.0	87	±1.4
This school has a good reputation.	92	±1.0	87	±1.4	81	±1.4	85	±1.2	82	±2.7	83	±2.5	84	±1.2	85	±1.4
This school's academic program is challenging and rigorous.	86	±1.4	85	±1.6	82	±1.0	83	±0.8	86	±2.7	82	±2.2	84	±0.8	82	±1.6
This school provides additional help to students who have trouble learning.	77	±1.8	77	±1.8	72	±1.6	74	±1.4	74	±2.4	76	±2.5	75	±1.2	73	±2.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 1 (characterization ratings), 18 (paygrade), 8 (school level), and 14, 15 and 16 (public school experience)

Table F.3.

Parents' Ratings of Overall School Quality for Sites with both DDESS Schools and a Target LEA

Installation/LEA	Percent Grading School with A or B					
	DDESS Parents				LEA Parents	
	Own child's school		Local public schools		Own child's school	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Fort Rucker/Daleville	90	±2.5	34	±2.7	60	±4.9
Fort Rucker/Enterprise	90	±2.5	34	±2.7	55	±3.7
Fort Stewart/Liberty County	86	±3.7	46	±4.9	53	±12.7
Robins AFB/Houston County	87	±0.0	36	±0.2	61	±8.2
Fort Campbell/Montgomery County	83	±2.5	35	±3.9	64	±4.3
Fort Bragg/Cumberland County	87	±2.4	31	±2.5	58	±9.6
Camp Lejeune/Onslow County	81	±2.0	34	±2.9	54	±8.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Questions 2g (own child's school) and 3Ad (local public schools); LEA Survey, Question 2g

Table F.4.

Simultaneous Regression Predicting DDESS Parents' Position on Transfer

Variable	<i>beta</i> (standardized b-value)	Standard error of <i>beta</i>
Relative rating of DDESS overall school quality	-0.35**	0.01
Level of concern with issues other than education quality	-0.29**	0.01
Paygrade (officer vs. all others)	-0.10**	0.02
Parent public school experience (parents with public school experience vs. those without)	-0.04**	0.02
Child's school level (elementary vs. all others)	<.005	0.02

** $p < .01$

Notes: $N=12,542$; $R^2 = .28$, $F(5, 12,537) = 960.44$, $p < .0001$

The negative *beta*-values are a result of the coding of the dependent variable ("parent position on transfer of the DDESS schools"). Parent responses were coded as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Code</u>
Strongly support a transfer	5
Somewhat support a transfer	4
Neutral or undecided	3
Somewhat oppose a transfer	2
Strongly oppose a transfer	1

Table F.5.

DDESS Parents' Grade Ratings of Overall Quality of DDESS School, by Installation

Installation	Percent Assigning Each Grade to DDESS School											
	A Excellent		B Good		C Satisfactory		D Poor		F Fail		A or B	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Dahlgren NSWC	78	±0.2	21	±0.2	1	±0.0	0	±0.0	0	±0.0	99	±0.0
West Point	64	±0.2	31	±0.2	4	±0.0	1	±0.0	0	±0.0	95	±0.0
Quantico MCB	65	±2.0	28	±2.4	6	±1.2	1	±0.4	0	±0.0	93	±1.4
Ft. Benning	62	±3.3	29	±3.3	7	±2.2	1	±1.0	0	±0.0	92	±2.2
Ft. Rucker	47	±3.7	43	±4.1	8	±2.2	2	±1.0	0	±0.4	90	±2.5
Ft. Jackson	53	±3.3	35	±2.9	10	±2.2	1	±1.0	0	±0.4	89	±2.4
Maxwell AFB	61	±0.2	28	±0.2	10	±0.2	2	±0.0	0	±0.0	89	±0.2
Laurel Bay MCB	57	±3.5	31	±2.7	11	±2.2	1	±0.6	0	±0.4	88	±2.2
Ft. Bragg	44	±2.4	43	±3.3	12	±2.2	1	±0.8	0	±0.2	87	±2.4
Robins AFB	48	±0.2	39	±0.2	13	±0.0	1	±0.0	0	±0.0	87	±0.0
Ft. McClellan	53	±0.4	34	±0.2	11	±0.2	1	±0.0	1	±0.0	87	±0.2
Ft. Stewart	41	±4.7	45	±5.3	13	±3.5	1	±0.8	0	±0.1	86	±3.7
Ft. Knox	47	±2.5	37	±2.7	13	±2.4	2	±0.8	1	±0.4	85	±2.4
Ft. Campbell	47	±3.7	36	±3.7	14	±2.2	3	±1.2	0	±0.2	83	±2.5
Camp Lejeune	42	±3	38	±2.9	16	±2.0	3	±1.0	0	±0.2	81	±2.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 2

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding. "A" and "B" percentages may not sum to "A or B" percentage due to rounding.

Table F.6.

DDESS Parents' Grade Ratings of Overall Quality of Local Schools, by Installation

Installation	Percent Assigning Each Grade To Local Schools											
	A		B		C		D		F		A or B	
	Excellent		Good		Satisfactory		Poor		Fail		A or B	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Ft. Stewart	8	±2.5	38	±3.9	35	±4.7	14	±3.7	5	±2.2	46	±4.9
Ft. Jackson	10	±2.7	29	±3.9	35	±3.5	18	±3.1	8	±2.2	39	±4.5
Robins AFB	5	±0.0	31	±0.2	41	±0.2	19	±0.2	3	±0.0	36	±0.2
Ft. Campbell	6	±1.8	28	±3.3	42	±3.5	18	±2.2	6	±1.8	35	±3.9
Camp Lejeune	6	±1.4	28	±2.9	42	±3.1	20	±2.2	5	±1.4	34	±2.9
Ft. Rucker	7	±2.2	27	±2.9	42	±2.5	18	±3.1	6	±1.4	34	±2.7
Quantico MCB	5	±1.0	27	±2.7	44	±3.1	20	±2.2	5	±1.2	31	±2.9
Ft. Knox	5	±1.4	26	±2.4	38	±2.7	24	±2.4	7	±1.4	31	±2.7
Ft. Bragg	6	±1.4	25	±2.2	34	±2.9	26	±3.1	10	±2.2	31	±2.5
Dahlgren NSWC	9	±0.2	21	±0.2	50	±0.2	16	±0.2	4	±0.0	30	±0.2
Ft. Benning	7	±1.6	23	±3.3	39	±3.1	23	±2.2	9	±1.8	30	±3.1
Ft. McClellan	4	±0.2	21	±0.2	37	±0.2	29	±0.2	10	±0.2	25	±0.2
West Point	2	±0.0	21	±0.2	47	±0.2	27	±0.2	4	±0.0	23	±0.2
Laurel Bay MCB	3	±1.4	14	±2.5	38	±4.5	37	±3.5	9	±1.8	16	±2.7
Maxwell AFB	1	±0.0	5	±0.0	26	±0.2	39	±0.2	30	±0.2	6	±0.0

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 3

Note: Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding. "A" and "B" percentages may not sum to "A or B" percentage due to rounding.

Table F.7.

DDESS Parents' Position on Transfer of DDESS Schools to LEA, by Installation

Installation	Percent with Each Position Regarding Transfer					
	Oppose ¹		Neutral		Support ²	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Maxwell AFB	95	±0.2	4	±0.0	0	±0.0
West Point	92	±0.2	6	±0.0	3	±0.0
Dahlgren NSWC	92	±0.2	5	±0.2	2	±0.0
Quantico MCB	91	±1.4	5	±1.2	4	±0.8
Ft. Benning	88	±2.2	8	±1.4	3	±0.6
Laurel Bay MCB	86	±3.1	9	±2.0	6	±0.8
Ft. Knox	85	±2.4	10	±1.6	5	±0.8
Robins AFB	83	±0.2	12	±0.2	4	±0.0
Ft. Bragg	82	±3.1	12	±2.0	7	±1.2
Camp Lejeune	82	±2.4	12	±1.8	7	±1.0
Ft. Jackson	82	±3.9	12	±2.5	6	±1.4
Ft. Rucker	80	±3.1	14	±2.2	6	±1.0
Ft. Campbell	79	±3.3	14	±2.4	9	±1.4
Ft. McClellan	78	±0.4	13	±0.2	9	±0.0
Ft. Stewart	71	±5.1	21	±3.7	8	±1.8

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 6*Note:* Rows may sum to more or less than 100 due to rounding.¹ Oppose includes parents who marked "Strongly opposed" or "Somewhat opposed."² Support includes parents who marked "Strongly support" or "Somewhat support."

Table F.8.
DDESS Parents' Level of Concern about Transfer Issues, by Installation

Transfer Issue	Percent "Very Concerned" about Given Issue														
	Robins AFB	Camp Lejeune	Ft. Bragg	Ft. Stewart	Ft. Knox	Ft. Jackson	Quantico MCB	Laurel Bay MCB	Ft. McClellan	Ft. Benning	Ft. Campbell	Ft. Rucker	Maxwell AFB	Dahlgren NSWC	West Point
Student safety CI (95%)	79 ±0.1	82 ±2.8	90 ±2.5	79 ±3.9	88 ±2.1	87 ±2.9	87 ±2.5	90 ±3.2	82 ±0.2	91 ±2.1	82 ±3.1	77 ±4.0	92 ±0.1	79 ±0.2	76 ±0.2
Attention given to the needs of military students CI (95%)	76 ±0.1	76 ±3.1	77 ±3.2	71 ±5.4	84 ±2.3	85 ±3.2	81 ±3.0	80 ±3.7	74 ±0.2	84 ±2.8	77 ±3.0	70 ±4.3	71 ±0.2	79 ±0.2	74 ±0.1
Possibility of student busing or the loss of neighborhood schools CI (95%)	71 ±0.2	76 ±2.7	74 ±3.1	66 ±5.7	78 ±2.5	77 ±3.5	79 ±3.2	75 ±4.6	67 ±0.3	86 ±2.3	78 ±3.1	67 ±4.2	71 ±0.2	70 ±0.4	69 ±0.2
Quality of instruction CI (95%)	69 ±0.2	69 ±3.0	72 ±3.6	58 ±4.7	74 ±2.8	69 ±4.1	69 ±3.5	75 ±4.1	68 ±0.3	78 ±2.9	69 ±3.4	73 ±5.3	82 ±0.2	85 ±0.3	79 ±0.2
Educational staffing levels CI (95%)	65 ±0.1	65 ±3.1	66 ±3.6	57 ±6.5	70 ±3.2	66 ±4.2	70 ±3.4	69 ±4.3	69 ±0.3	75 ±3.4	65 ±3.9	70 ±4.0	81 ±0.3	75 ±0.3	76 ±0.1
Educational funding levels CI (95%)	64 ±0.2	62 ±3.5	66 ±3.5	56 ±6.5	71 ±3.1	67 ±4.3	60 ±3.5	63 ±5.1	74 ±0.3	74 ±3.6	67 ±3.7	72 ±4.4	83 ±0.2	75 ±0.4	82 ±0.2
Academic rigor of educational programs CI (95%)	59 ±0.2	59 ±3.1	64 ±3.7	50 ±5.7	68 ±3.1	64 ±4.1	63 ±3.6	70 ±5.1	67 ±0.3	73 ±3.3	62 ±3.2	65 ±5.2	80 ±0.2	82 ±0.3	74 ±0.1
Links to base services and programs CI (95%)	58 ±0.1	59 ±2.9	61 ±4.0	57 ±5.0	70 ±2.8	72 ±5.6	61 ±4.1	63 ±4.4	54 ±0.4	72 ±3.7	62 ±4.0	55 ±4.1	54 ±0.3	56 ±0.4	58 ±0.1
Variety of courses and educational programs CI (95%)	45 ±0.2	48 ±3.2	56 ±3.6	48 ±5.6	61 ±3.6	58 ±4.2	48 ±3.8	57 ±5.4	60 ±0.3	70 ±3.1	57 ±3.5	61 ±4.4	66 ±0.2	55 ±0.3	64 ±0.2
Ability to influence school policy CI (95%)	53 ±0.2	50 ±2.9	50 ±3.7	40 ±5.9	63 ±3.2	57 ±5.2	56 ±3.2	53 ±4.9	49 ±0.3	66 ±3.2	52 ±3.5	48 ±4.8	53 ±0.2	59 ±0.4	63 ±0.3
Availability of special education programs CI (95%)	34 ±0.3	38 ±3.3	45 ±4.0	34 ±5.3	47 ±3.1	47 ±4.4	32 ±3.8	45 ±5.3	44 ±0.2	51 ±3.7	43 ±3.6	42 ±4.6	41 ±0.2	36 ±0.2	39 ±0.2

Source: DDESS Survey, Question 7

Table F.9.
*Computing Basic Support Payments*¹

Under Public Law No. 103-382, to be eligible for basic support payments, a school district must have at least 400 Federally connected students *or* these students must comprise at least 3 percent of the district's average daily attendance (ADA). To receive basic support payments, a school district must conduct a student survey each year to identify the number and types of Federal children it is enrolling. The school district then completes the Impact Aid application and submits it directly to the U.S. Department of Education.

Since different types of Federal students have a different financial impact on the school district, each type of Federal student is assigned a weight. The higher the weight, the higher the impact these students have on the school district. These weights are used to generate student counts referred to as Weighted Federal Student Units (WFSU). Some example student weights are as follows:

Student Type	Weight
Student living on Indian property	1.25
Military student living on Federal property	1.00
Non-military student living on Federal property and parent works on Federal property	1.00
Military student not living on Federal property	.10
Student living in low-rent housing project	.10
Civilian student whose parent works on Federal property	.05

The maximum basic support payment a school district can receive is based on the school district's WFSU and its Local Contribution Rate (LCR). The LCR is a measure used to determine the local financial burden of educating Federally connected children. Normally, it is either half of the state or national average per-pupil expenditure, whichever is higher. Payments are calculated as follows.

1. Determine the LCR.
2. Multiply each Federal student by his/her weight.
3. Add the weighted counts of all Federal students (to produce total WFSU).
4. Multiply step 1 (LCR) by step 3 (WFSU) to obtain the maximum Basic Support Payment (BSP).

Note: When the total Congressional appropriation amount is insufficient to pay the full BSP (the program has not been sufficiently funded since the 1960s), additional calculations are necessary:

5. Divide the LEA Federal ADA by the LEA total ADA (all students) to obtain the LEA percentage of Federal students.
6. Divide the BSP by the total LEA current operating expenditures to obtain the percentage of the current operating budget represented by the BSP.
7. Add step 5 (the percentage of Federal students in the LEA) and step 6 (the percentage of current operating expenses represented by the BSP) to determine the Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifier (LOT MOD). If this number is greater than 100 percent, use 100 percent. The LOT MOD cannot exceed 100 percent.
8. Multiply the LOT MOD percentage (step 7) by the maximum BSP (calculated in step 4) to obtain the LOT or Basic Support Payment.
9. When Congressional appropriations are insufficient to pay each LEA its maximum BSP, Impact Aid payments are pro-rated to the LEAs based on the LOT or Basic Support Payment.

¹ Source: Proulx, 1996; *Public Law 103-382*.

Table F.10.
Impact Aid Basic Support Payments for DDESS Students

Installation	State	1995-96 DDESS Enrollment	1993-94 State PPE	Basic Payment Per Student¹	Total Payment
Ft. McClellan	AL	383	\$4,037	\$2,883.50	\$1,104,381
Ft. Rucker	AL	1,102	\$4,037	\$2,883.50	\$3,177,617
Maxwell AFB	AL	450	\$4,037	\$2,883.50	\$1,297,575
Ft. Benning	GA	3,164	\$4,915	\$2,883.50	\$9,123,394
Ft. Stewart	GA	1,663	\$4,915	\$2,883.50	\$4,795,261
Robins AFB	GA	890	\$4,915	\$2,883.50	\$2,566,315
Ft. Campbell	KY	4,297	\$5,107	\$2,883.50	\$12,390,400
Ft. Knox	KY	3,677	\$5,107	\$2,883.50	\$10,602,630
Camp Lejeune	NC	3,505	\$4,894	\$2,883.50	\$10,106,668
Ft. Bragg	NC	4,719	\$4,894	\$2,883.50	\$13,607,237
West Point	NY	725	\$9,175	\$4,587.50	\$3,325,938
Ft. Jackson	SC	1,034	\$4,761	\$2,883.50	\$2,981,539
Laurel Bay	SC	1,285	\$4,761	\$2,883.50	\$3,705,298
Dahlgren	VA	158	\$5,109	\$2,883.50	\$455,593
Quantico	VA	1,301	\$5,109	\$2,883.50	\$3,751,434
		National PPE	\$5,767	Total	\$82,991,276

Source: Snyder, Hoffman, & Geddes, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1996*; DoD DDESS Directory, School Year 1995-1996.

¹ All per-pupil basic payments except for West Point (NY) are based on one-half of the national per-pupil expenditure of \$5,767. The West Point basic payment is based on one-half of the New York state per-pupil expenditure.

Table F.11.

Distribution of Fiscal Year 1996 DoD Supplement Among 93 Target LEAs

STATE	DISTRICT	Basic Support	BRAC ¹
Alabama	Daleville City School System	\$70,973	
Alabama	Enterprise City School System	\$59,413	
Alaska	Anchorage School District		
Alaska	Delta-Greely School District	\$40,725	
Alaska	Fairbanks School District		
Alaska	Kodiak School District		
Arizona	Fort Huachuca School District	\$533,196	
Arizona	Palominas Elementary School District		
Arizona	Sierra Vista Unified School District	\$127,744	\$909,360
California	Central Unified School District	\$204,583	
California	Coronado Unified School District	\$192,465	
California	Fallbrook Union Elementary School District	\$548,015	
California	Fort Sage Unified School District		
California	Lemoore Union High School District	\$82,612	
California	Monterey Peninsula Unified School District		\$1,004,955
California	Muroc Joint Unified School District	\$655,632	
California	San Antonio Unified School District	\$22,110	
California	Sierra Sands Unified School District	\$192,576	
California	Silver Valley Unified School District	\$583,822	
California	Travis Unified School District	\$578,048	
California	Two Rock Union School District	\$42,585	
California	Wheatland School District	\$380,212	
California	Wheatland Union High School District	\$69,224	
Colorado	El Paso County School District #3	\$27,234	
Colorado	El Paso County School District #8	\$616,590	
Connecticut	Groton School District	\$370,996	
Florida	Okaloosa County School District	\$964,288	
Georgia	Camden County School District	\$204,967	
Georgia	Houston County School District	\$229,860	
Georgia	Liberty County School District	\$261,927	
Hawaii	Hawaii Central School District	\$2,008,940	
Idaho	Mountain Home School District #193	\$439,663	
Illinois	Belle Valley School District #119	\$3,419	
Illinois	Mascoutah Community Unit School District #19	\$512,672	
Illinois	North Chicago School District #187	\$213,529	
Illinois	O'Fallon Elementary School District #90	\$8,526	
Illinois	O'Fallon Township High School District #203	\$15,085	
Indiana	Loogootee Community School Corporation		
Kansas	Fort Leavenworth Unified School District	\$317,226	
Kansas	Geary County Unified School District #475	\$457,584	
Kansas	Lansing Unified School District #469		
Louisiana	Vernon Parish	\$457,270	
Maine	Kittery School District	\$129,486	\$220,231
Maine	Winter Harbor School District	\$23,625	
Massachusetts	Ayer School Community	\$167,408	\$318,246
Mississippi	Biloxi Public School District	\$263,553	
Missouri	Knob Noster R-VIII School District	\$304,682	
Missouri	Plato R-V School District		

¹Funds allocated for LEAs affected by Base Realignments and Closures

(continued)

Table F.11 (continued).

Distribution of Fiscal Year 1996 DoD Supplement Among 93 Target LEAs

STATE	DISTRICT	Basic	BRAC
Missouri	Waynesville R-VI School District	\$674,379	\$101,072
Nebraska	Bellevue Public Schools	\$447,097	
Nevada	Mineral County		
New Jersey	Cape May City School District	\$52,249	
New Jersey	Eatontown School District	\$210,585	
New Jersey	Monmouth Regional High School District		
New Jersey	North Hanover Township School District	\$441,386	
New Jersey	Northern Burlington County School District	\$142,948	
New Mexico	Alamogordo Municipal School District #1	\$392,696	
New York	Indian River Central School District	\$424,283	
North Carolina	Craven County School District	\$649,472	
North Carolina	Cumberland County School District	\$324,048	
North Carolina	Onslow County School District	\$97,595	
North Dakota	Emerado School District #127	\$708	
North Dakota	Glenburn School District #26		
North Dakota	Grand Forks AFB School District #140	\$338,878	\$419,286
North Dakota	Larimore School District #44		
North Dakota	Minot AFB School District #160	\$276,539	
Ohio	Beavercreek Local School District		
Ohio	Fairborn City School District		
Ohio	Mad River Local School District	\$338,911	
Oklahoma	Altus School District	\$257,671	
Oklahoma	Bishop Elementary School District	\$904	
Oklahoma	Lawton School District	\$642,046	
Rhode Island	Middletown School District	\$93,643	
South Dakota	Douglas School District #51-1	\$234,273	
Tennessee	Clarksville-Montgomery County School District	\$206,072	\$252,298
Texas	Burkburnett Independent School District	\$207,287	
Texas	Copperas Cove Independent School District	\$84,843	
Texas	Fort Sam Houston Independent School District	\$156,678	
Texas	Judson Independent School District		
Texas	Killeen Independent School District	\$2,508,667	
Texas	Lackland Independent School District	\$150,609	
Texas	New Boston Independent School District		
Texas	Randolph Field Independent School District	\$164,442	
Utah	Tooele County School District		
Virginia	Prince George County School District	\$385,779	
Virginia	Virginia Beach City School District	\$1,610,617	
Virginia	York County School District	\$667,271	
Washington	Bremerton County School District #100		\$55,989
Washington	Central Kitsap School District #401	\$528,020	
Washington	Clover Park School District #400	\$755,160	
Washington	Medical Lake School District #326	\$148,413	
Washington	Oak Harbor School District #201	\$433,667	
Washington	South Kitsap School District # 402	\$55,989	
Total		\$26,486,293	\$3,262,959

Source: National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, *School Districts Eligible for Assistance Under Section 386, P.L. 102-484, as amended, 1997.*

Table F.12.
LEA Funding Sources, School Year 1992-93

STATE	DISTRICT	Percent of Revenues from (source)		
		Local	State	Federal
Alabama	Daleville City School System	17	66	17
Alabama	Enterprise City School System	26	63	11
Alaska	Anchorage School District	21	68	11
Alaska	Delta-Greely School District	3	63	33
Alaska	Fairbanks School District	21	61	18
Alaska	Kodiak School District	16	66	19
Arizona	Fort Huachuca School District	13	2	85
Arizona	Palominas Elementary School District	27	70	4
Arizona	Sierra Vista Unified School District	40	52	8
California	Central Unified School District	35	59	6
California	Coronado Unified School District	44	46	10
California	Fallbrook Union Elementary School District	55	33	12
California	Fort Sage Unified School District	20	72	8
California	Lemoore Union High School District	25	69	6
California	Monterey Peninsula Unified School District	28	57	15
California	Muroc Joint Unified School District	21	55	24
California	San Antonio Unified School District	28	62	10
California	Sierra Sands Unified School District	22	71	7
California	Silver Valley Unified School District	20	62	19
California	Travis Unified School District	14	69	17
California	Two Rock Union School District	29	51	19
California	Wheatland School District	8	71	22
California	Wheatland Union High School District	20	69	11
Colorado	El Paso County School District #3	46	49	5
Connecticut	Groton School District	49	48	3
Florida	Okaloosa County School District	29	63	8
Georgia	Houston County School District	33	60	7
Georgia	Liberty County School District	18	72	10
Hawaii	Hawaii Central School District	2	91	7
Idaho	Mountain Home School District #193	19	62	19
Illinois	Belle Valley School District #119	43	51	6
Illinois	Mascoutah Community Unit School District #19	17	60	23
Illinois	North Chicago School District #187	33	51	16
Illinois	O'Fallon Elementary School District #90	49	45	6
Illinois	O'Fallon Township High School District #203	56	41	3
Indiana	Loogootee Community School Corporation	34	61	6
Kansas	Fort Leavenworth Unified School District	5	18	78
Kansas	Geary County Unified School District #475	16	57	27
Kansas	Lansing Unified School District #469	30	65	4
Louisiana	Vernon Parish	19	63	18
Maine	Kittery School District	68	27	6
Maine	Winter Harbor School District	36	45	20
Massachusetts	Ayer School Community	36	33	30
Mississippi	Biloxi Public School District	25	53	22
Missouri	Knob Noster R-VIII School District	27	46	27

(continued)

Table F.12 (continued).
LEA Funding Sources, School Year 1992-93

STATE	DISTRICT	Percent of Revenues from (source)		
		Local	State	Federal
Missouri	Plato R-V School District	35	57	8
Missouri	Waynesville R-VI School District	22	53	25
Nebraska	Bellevue Public Schools	32	43	25
Nevada	Mineral County School District	26	64	10
New Jersey	North Hanover Township School District	8	41	51
New Mexico	Alamogordo Municipal School District #1	13	75	12
New York	Indian River Central School District	9	77	15
North Carolina	Craven County School District	21	67	13
North Carolina	Cumberland County School District	21	67	12
North Carolina	Onslow County School District	20	69	11
North Dakota	Emerado School District #127	41	34	25
North Dakota	Glenburn School District #26	45	46	9
North Dakota	Larimore School District #44	44	50	6
Ohio	Beavercreek Local School District	64	35	2
Ohio	Fairborn City School District	45	48	8
Ohio	Mad River Local School District	38	57	5
Oklahoma	Altus School District	19	67	15
Oklahoma	Lawton School District	25	62	13
Rhode Island	Middletown School District	54	33	13
South Dakota	Douglas School District #51-1	20	24	57
Tennessee	Clarksville-Montgomery County School District	37	52	10
Texas	Burkburnett Independent School District	34	58	8
Texas	Copperas Cove Independent School District	15	64	21
Texas	Fort Sam Houston Independent School District	4	65	31
Texas	Judson Independent School District	38	58	4
Texas	Killeen Independent School District	16	71	13
Texas	Lackland Independent School District	4	66	30
Texas	New Boston Independent School District	22	70	8
Texas	Randolph Field Independent School District	5	67	29
Utah	Tooele County School District	33	57	10
Virginia	Prince George County School District	42	46	12
Virginia	Virginia Beach City School District	52	41	8
Virginia	York County School District	44	41	16
Washington	Bremerton County School District #100	20	75	5
Washington	Central Kitsap School District #401	22	72	6
Washington	Clover Park School District #400	11	73	15
Washington	Medical Lake School District #326	6	79	15
Washington	Oak Harbor School District #201	6	84	10
Washington	South Kitsap School District # 402	18	78	5
	LEA Average¹	22	67	11
	34-state Average²	44	48	7
	National Average	47	46	7

Source: Common Core of Data (CCD) School Years 1987-88 through 1992-93, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics

¹ This is a weighted average based on the total revenues for each funding category for all 84 LEAs. A weighted average was used here to be comparable to the national average which is also similarly weighted.

² This is a weighted average based on the total revenues for each funding category for all 34 states. A weighted average was used here to be comparable to the national average which is also similarly weighted.

Table F.13.

School Year 1992-93 Impact Aid Maximum Basic Support Payments (BSPs) and Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifiers (LOT MODs), for 93 Target LEAs

State	Local Education Agency	Total ADA	3A ADA	3B ADA	WFSU ¹	State PPE	LEA PPE	Local Contrib Rate (LCR) ²	Maximum BSP	BSP as Pct of LEA Budget	Pct Mil Stdnts	LOT MOD
Alabama	Daleville City School System	1,495	159	227	182	\$3,761	\$3,085	\$2,792	\$507,371	11%	26%	37%
Alabama	Enterprise City School System	5,130	146	953	241	\$3,761	\$3,413	\$2,792	\$672,816	4%	21%	25%
Alaska	Anchorage School District	39,463	2	2,621	264	\$8,735	\$6,631	\$4,368	\$1,152,928	<1%	7%	7%
Alaska	Delta-Greely School District	908	244	11	246	\$8,735	\$9,489	\$4,368	\$1,072,553	12%	28%	41%
Alaska	Fairbanks School District	12,076		106	11	\$8,735	\$8,519	\$4,368	\$46,278	<1%	1%	1%
Alaska	Kodiak School District	2,083	1	73	8	\$8,735	\$8,471	\$4,368	\$35,726	<1%	4%	4%
Arizona	Fort Huachuca School District	1,465	1,414	48	1,419	\$4,510	\$4,367	\$2,792	\$3,960,597	62%	100%	100%
Arizona	Palominas Elementary School District	850		46	5	\$4,510	\$5,784	\$2,792	\$12,826	<1%	5%	6%
Arizona	Sierra Vista Unified School District	6,129	269	932	362	\$4,510	\$3,774	\$2,792	\$1,011,399	4%	20%	24%
California	Central Unified School District	1,843	1,221	37	1,225	\$4,780	\$4,123	\$2,792	\$3,418,851	45%	68%	100%
California	Coronado Unified School District	2,377	476	384	515	\$4,780	\$4,754	\$2,792	\$1,436,947	13%	36%	49%
California	Fallbrook Union Elementary Schl Dist	5,877	1,461	522	1,514	\$4,780	\$4,583	\$2,792	\$4,226,234	16%	34%	49%
California	Fort Sage Unified School District	494	98		98	\$4,780	\$6,271	\$2,792	\$274,258	9%	20%	29%
California	Lemoore Union High School District	1,612	205	198	225	\$4,780	\$5,666	\$2,792	\$628,867	7%	25%	32%
California	Monterey Peninsula Unified Schl Dist	15,573	5,136	721	5,208	\$4,780	\$5,231	\$2,792	\$14,539,843	18%	38%	55%
California	Muroc Joint Unified School District	2,853	1,862	71	1,869	\$4,780	\$5,218	\$2,792	\$5,217,424	35%	68%	100%
California	San Antonio Unified School District	269	37	14	38	\$4,780	\$3,660	\$2,792	\$106,936	11%	19%	30%
California	Sierra Sands Unified School District	6,919	425	101	435	\$4,780	\$4,041	\$2,792	\$1,214,704	4%	8%	12%
California	Silver Valley Unified School District	2,871	1,666	59	1,672	\$4,780	\$6,032	\$2,792	\$4,668,863	27%	60%	87%
California	Travis Unified School District	3,856	1,589	681	1,657	\$4,780	\$5,423	\$2,792	\$4,626,944	22%	59%	81%
California	Two Rock Union School District	180	106		106	\$4,780	\$5,022	\$2,792	\$295,784	33%	59%	92%
California	Wheatland School District	1,965	1,137	88	1,146	\$4,780	\$4,884	\$2,792	\$3,199,705	33%	62%	96%
California	Wheatland Union High School District	540	198	24	201	\$4,780	\$5,600	\$2,792	\$560,447	19%	41%	60%
Colorado	El Paso County School District #3	7,142		1,761	176	\$5,139	\$4,016	\$2,792	\$491,604	2%	25%	26%
Colorado	El Paso County School District #8	3,773	1,563	496	1,612	\$5,139	\$4,812	\$2,792	\$4,501,514	25%	55%	79%
Connecticut	Groton School District	5,662	1,922	200	1,942	\$7,973	\$8,173	\$3,987	\$7,742,772	17%	37%	54%

¹ Weighted Federal Student Unit

(continued)

² Figures in **boldface** under LCR are one-half the national PPE rate of \$5,584.

Table F.13 (continued).

School Year 1992-93 Impact Aid Maximum Basic Support Payments (BSPs) and Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifiers (LOT MODs), for 93 Target LEAs

State	Local Education Agency	Total ADA	3A ADA	3B ADA	WFSU	State PPE	LEA PPE	Local Contrib Rate (LCR) ¹	Maximum BSP	BSP as Pct of LEA Budget	Pct Mil Stdnts	LOT MOD
Florida	Okaloosa County School District	25,804	2,439	5,407	2,980	\$5,314	\$4,347	\$2,792	\$8,320,417	7%	30%	38%
Georgia	Camden County School District	7,099	498	2,113	709	\$4,686	\$4,659	\$2,792	\$1,980,220	6%	37%	43%
Georgia	Houston County School District	15,883	386	1,049	491	\$4,686	\$4,650	\$2,792	\$1,371,905	2%	9%	11%
Georgia	Liberty County School District	8,634	554	2,799	834	\$4,686	\$4,190	\$2,792	\$2,327,540	6%	39%	45%
Hawaii	Hawaii Central School District	33,694	10,874	1,392	11,013	\$5,704	\$5,991	\$2,852	\$31,408,623	16%	36%	52%
Idaho	Mountain Home School District #193	3,864	1,177	626	1,239	\$3,690	\$3,642	\$2,792	\$3,459,562	25%	47%	71%
Illinois	Belle Valley School District #119	1,048		306	31	\$5,898	\$3,347	\$2,949	\$90,346	3%	29%	32%
Illinois	Mascoutah Community Schl District #19	2,849	1,469	217	1,491	\$5,898	\$4,343	\$2,949	\$4,396,977	36%	59%	95%
Illinois	North Chicago School District #187	3,901	1,468	22	1,470	\$5,898	\$5,335	\$2,949	\$4,336,224	21%	38%	59%
Illinois	O'Fallon Elementary School District #90	2,184		654	65	\$5,898	\$3,671	\$2,949	\$192,761	2%	30%	32%
Illinois	O'Fallon Township High School District #203	1,483		394	39	\$5,898	\$4,570	\$2,949	\$116,279	2%	27%	28%
Indiana	Loogootee Community School Corporation	1,153	36	8	36	\$5,344	\$4,668	\$2,792	\$101,858	2%	4%	6%
Kansas	Fort Leavenworth Unified School District	1,733	1,664	48	1,669	\$5,442	\$5,152	\$2,792	\$4,659,546	52%	99%	100%
Kansas	Geary County Unified School District #475	6,061	2,250	1,121	2,362	\$5,442	\$4,728	\$2,792	\$6,594,620	23%	56%	79%
Kansas	Lansing Unified School District #469	1,704		402	40	\$5,442	\$4,442	\$2,792	\$112,141	1%	24%	25%
Louisiana	Vernon Parish	10,755	2,190	1,420	2,332	\$4,438	\$3,882	\$2,792	\$6,510,723	16%	34%	49%
Maine	Kittery School District	1,199	170	238	194	\$6,073	\$6,746	\$3,037	\$588,298	7%	34%	41%
Maine	Winter Harbor School District	158	71	14	73	\$6,073	\$4,461	\$3,037	\$220,899	31%	54%	86%
Massachusetts	Ayer School Community	2,024	1,197	47	1,201	\$6,627	\$5,317	\$3,314	\$3,981,114	37%	61%	98%
Mississippi	Biloxi Public School District	6,231	1,308	458	1,354	\$3,382	\$3,432	\$2,792	\$3,780,552	18%	28%	46%
Missouri	Knob Noster R-VIII School District	1,889	854	338	888	\$4,885	\$4,273	\$2,792	\$2,479,919	31%	63%	94%
Missouri	Plato R-V School District	460		88	9	\$4,885	\$3,224	\$2,792	\$24,609	2%	19%	21%
Missouri	Waynesville R-VI School District	4,630	2,177	1,037	2,280	\$4,885	\$4,028	\$2,792	\$6,366,866	34%	69%	100%

(continued)

Table F.13 (continued).

School Year 1992-93 Impact Aid Maximum Basic Support Payments (BSPs) and Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifiers (LOT MODs), for 93 Target LEAs

State	Local Education Agency	Total ADA	3A ADA	3B ADA	WFSU	State PPE	LEA PPE	Local Contrib Rate (LCR) ¹	Maximum BSP	BSP as Pct of LEA Budget	Pct Mil Stdnts	LOT MOD
Nebraska	Bellevue Public Schools	7,898	2,063	1,717	2,234	\$5,336	\$6,248	\$2,792	\$6,238,277	13%	48%	61%
Nevada	Mineral County	1,128	65	3	66	\$5,066	\$5,299	\$2,792	\$183,111	3%	6%	9%
New Jersey	Cape May City School District	274	131		131	\$9,415	\$6,745	\$4,708	\$617,247	33%	48%	81%
New Jersey	Eatontown School District	1,627	652	15	653	\$9,415	\$6,539	\$4,708	\$3,075,000	29%	41%	70%
New Jersey	Monmouth Regional High School District	886	182	16	183	\$9,415	\$13,558	\$4,708	\$862,188	7%	22%	29%
New Jersey	North Hanover Township School District	1,557	1,128	14	1,129	\$9,415	\$5,363	\$4,708	\$5,317,102	64%	73%	100%
New Jersey	Northern Burlington Co. School District	1,297	402	14	403	\$9,415	\$8,828	\$4,708	\$1,899,241	17%	32%	49%
New Mexico	Alamogordo School District #1	7,211	987	1,023	1,090	\$4,071	\$3,545	\$2,792	\$3,042,247	12%	28%	40%
New York	Indian River Central School District	3,553	1,010	696	1,079	\$8,902	\$7,099	\$4,451	\$4,803,475	19%	48%	67%
North Carolina	Craven County School District	13,592	1,887	1,294	2,017	\$4,763	\$4,280	\$2,792	\$5,631,090	10%	23%	33%
North Carolina	Cumberland County School District	44,672	457	12,704	1,727	\$4,763	\$4,269	\$2,792	\$4,821,854	3%	29%	32%
North Carolina	Onslow County School District	17,346	14	5,976	611	\$4,763	\$3,896	\$2,792	\$1,706,300	3%	35%	37%
North Dakota	Emerado School District #127	180		37	4	\$4,597	\$7,432	\$2,792	\$10,383	1%	21%	21%
North Dakota	Glenburn School District #26	304		69	7	\$4,597	\$4,586	\$2,792	\$19,388	1%	23%	24%
North Dakota	Grand Forks AFB School District #140	1,863	1,863		1,863	\$4,597	\$4,600	\$2,792	\$5,200,435	61%	100%	100%
North Dakota	Larimore School District #44	605		130	13	\$4,597	\$4,209	\$2,792	\$36,282	1%	21%	23%
North Dakota	Minot AFB School District #160	1,519	1,516		1,516	\$4,597	\$4,020	\$2,792	\$4,234,012	69%	100%	100%
Ohio	Beavercreek Local School District	6,161		878	88	\$5,754	\$4,832	\$2,877	\$252,543	1%	14%	15%
Ohio	Fairborn City School District	6,072	781	542	835	\$5,754	\$4,674	\$2,877	\$2,402,318	8%	22%	30%
Ohio	Mad River Local School District	3,693	972	147	987	\$5,754	\$4,852	\$2,877	\$2,838,799	16%	30%	46%
Oklahoma	Altus School District	4,387	697	732	770	\$4,355	\$4,157	\$2,792	\$2,149,726	12%	33%	44%
Oklahoma	Bishop Elementary School District	218		28	3	\$4,355	\$4,183	\$2,792	\$7,913	1%	13%	14%
Oklahoma	Lawton School District	17,754	1,526	4,734	1,999	\$4,355	\$4,446	\$2,792	\$5,582,177	7%	35%	42%
Rhode Island	Middletown School District	2,664	772	157	787	\$6,938	\$6,858	\$3,469	\$2,731,553	15%	35%	50%
South Dakota	Douglas School District #51-1	2,575	1,401	284	1,429	\$4,357	\$4,202	\$2,792	\$3,989,383	37%	65%	100%

(continued)

Table F.13 (continued).

School Year 1992-93 Impact Aid Maximum Basic Support Payments (BSPs) and Learning Opportunity Threshold Modifiers (LOT MODs), for 93 Target LEAs

State	Local Education Agency	Total ADA	3A ADA	3B ADA	WFSU	State PPE	LEA PPE	Local Contrib Rate (LCR) ¹	Maximum BSP	BSP as Pct of LEA Budget	Pct Mil Stdnts	LOT MOD
Tennessee	Clarksville-Montgomery County School District	17,442	13	4,357	449	\$3,993	\$3,535	\$2,792	\$1,253,471	2%	25%	27%
Texas	Burkburnett Independent School District	3,038	501	367	538	\$4,670	\$3,930	\$2,792	\$1,501,138	13%	29%	41%
Texas	Copperas Cove Independent School District	6,761	88	2,926	381	\$4,670	\$4,582	\$2,792	\$1,063,565	3%	45%	48%
Texas	Fort Sam Houston Independent School District	1,212	1,059	132	1,073	\$4,670	\$6,820	\$2,792	\$2,994,842	36%	98%	100%
Texas	Judson Independent School District	12,675	9	2,683	277	\$4,670	\$4,616	\$2,792	\$774,632	1%	21%	23%
Texas	Killeen Independent School District	24,678	6,169	7,559	6,925	\$4,670	\$4,976	\$2,792	\$19,335,569	16%	56%	71%
Texas	Lackland Independent School District	860	849	10	850	\$4,670	\$5,633	\$2,792	\$2,372,312	49%	100%	100%
Texas	New Boston Independent School District	1,492	23	3	23	\$4,670	\$4,479	\$2,792	\$63,864	1%	2%	3%
Texas	Randolph Field Independent Schl District	953	877	47	881	\$4,670	\$5,547	\$2,792	\$2,460,947	47%	97%	100%
Utah	Tooele County School District	6,931	435	28	438	\$3,180	\$3,762	\$2,792	\$1,223,502	5%	7%	11%
Virginia	Prince George County School District	4,892	1,018	390	1,057	\$4,980	\$4,936	\$2,792	\$2,951,013	12%	29%	41%
Virginia	Virginia Beach City School District	70,088	3,989	19,598	5,948	\$4,980	\$4,882	\$2,792	\$16,607,804	5%	34%	39%
Virginia	York County School District	9,943	2,027	1,852	2,212	\$4,980	\$4,394	\$2,792	\$6,175,664	14%	39%	53%
Washington	Bremerton County School District #100	5,957	258	513	309	\$5,614	\$7,514	\$2,807	\$867,150	2%	13%	15%
Washington	Central Kitsap School District #401	11,683	1,174	2,180	1,392	\$5,614	\$6,697	\$2,807	\$3,907,625	5%	29%	34%
Washington	Clover Park School District #400	12,586	3,801	1,307	3,932	\$5,614	\$5,517	\$2,807	\$11,037,464	16%	41%	56%
Washington	Medical Lake School District #326	2,071	791	154	806	\$5,614	\$5,711	\$2,807	\$2,262,995	19%	46%	65%
Washington	Oak Harbor School District #201	5,820	1,065	1,867	1,252	\$5,614	\$4,593	\$2,807	\$3,514,420	13%	50%	64%
Washington	South Kitsap School District # 402	10,289	7	770	84	\$5,614	\$4,970	\$2,807	\$234,612	<1%	8%	8%
									\$307,300,823			

Data Sources: U.S. Department of Education Report DHSC8772, *Impact Aid Program, Section 3 Recipient Districts*, March 11, 1996; Snyder, Hoffman & Geddes, 1996, Table 165; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Common Core of Data, School Years 1987-88 through 1992-93*

APPENDIX G
SITE VISIT REPORTS

Fort McClellan, Alabama

The 1993 Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommended closing Fort McClellan. The closure date is September 30, 1999.

The Installation

Fort McClellan is located in Calhoun County in northeastern Alabama. The closest town, Anniston (population 26,000), is approximately three miles to the south and the home of the Anniston Army Depot. Jacksonville City, a small college town, is located about five miles north of Fort McClellan. The nearest large cities are Atlanta, Georgia, located 90 miles to the west, and Birmingham, Alabama, 55 miles to the east.

Fort McClellan was established in 1917 as an infantry training center. The Women's Army Corps was established there in 1952. In 1954, it became the home of the U.S. Women's Army Corps Center. This mission ended when the Women's Army Corps was disestablished in 1978. The Military Police School moved to Fort McClellan in 1975, and the Army Chemical School relocated to Fort McClellan in 1979.

Today, Fort McClellan's main mission is training. Most Military Police and Chemical Corps officers (including noncommissioned officers) can expect at least two assignments to Fort McClellan during their military careers. Since most training courses are less than one year, the installation population is highly transient. Fort McClellan is a closed post.

Fort McClellan supports 2,300 active-duty personnel and 3,700 family members. The 577 family housing units (117 officer and 460 enlisted) located on the installation allow about one-third of family members to live on the installation. As an employer of 2,450 local civilians, Fort McClellan contributes substantially to the area's economy.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

Prior to 1963, all Fort McClellan students attended school in the city of Anniston. In 1963, Fort McClellan Elementary School was established in response to segregation in the local community. Today the Fort McClellan DDESS system consists of a single school, Fort McClellan Elementary School, serving kindergarten through grade 6. The school has a current enrollment of 383 students. These 383 DDESS students are 21 percent of the 1,802 Fort McClellan-affiliated students living on or off the installation.

On-post students in grades 7-12 are given the option of attending one of three LEAs: Calhoun County, Anniston City, or Jacksonville City. Transportation is provided by each LEA.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Because of the current arrangement for Fort McClellan secondary students, three LEAs could be considered as possible candidates to accept responsibility for the Fort McClellan elementary school students. Enrollment statistics on these three LEAs are provided in Table G.1.

Table G.1.
Enrollment of School Districts Adjacent to Fort McClellan

Student Group	Calhoun County (15 schools)		Anniston City (11 schools)		Jacksonville City (2 schools)		Total (28 schools)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Military Students								
Living On the Installation	51	<1	57	1	56	4	164	1
Living Off the Installation	731	7	302	8	222	15	1,255	8
All Other Students	9,488	92	3,513	91	1,238	82	14,239	91
Total Enrollment:	10,270		3,872		1,516		15,658	

Note: Percentages may sum to more than 100 due to rounding.

The 164 on-post students in grades 7-12 are evenly distributed across the three LEAs (Calhoun County 31%, Anniston City 35%, and Jacksonville City 34%). Each of these LEAs has a middle school or high school located near the installation.

All three LEAs offer full education programs for grades K-12. Similarities and differences among the LEAs are outlined below.

Jacksonville City is the smallest of the three local systems with only two schools and a total enrollment of 1,516. Jacksonville's enrollment includes 278 military-connected students; these students account for 18 percent of district's total enrollment. Jacksonville schools educate about 15 percent of the 1,802 military-connected students in the area. Adding the 383 Fort McClellan elementary school students to the Jacksonville LEA would increase this district's enrollment by 25 percent and raise its proportion of military-connected students from 18 percent to 35 percent.

Anniston City has 11 schools and a total enrollment of 3,872. Anniston's enrollment includes 359 military-connected students, comprising 9 percent of the district's total enrollment. Anniston schools educate about 20 percent of all the military-connected students in the area. Assigning the 383 Fort McClellan elementary school students to Anniston City would increase the district's enrollment by 10 percent and raise the proportion of military-connected students from 9 percent to 17 percent.

Calhoun County is the largest of the three systems with 15 schools and a total enrollment of 10,270 students. Calhoun County's enrollment includes 782 military-connected students, accounting for 8 percent of the district's total enrollment. Calhoun County schools educate about 43 percent of the 1,802 military-connected students in the area. Adding the 383 Fort McClellan elementary school students to Calhoun County would increase the county's enrollment by 4 percent and raise the proportion of military-connected students from 8 percent to 11 percent.

Interactions between each of the LEAs and the Fort McClellan DDESS system are frequent since the older on-post students select an LEA to attend. Each of the three LEAs provide a student-parent orientation for Fort McClellan's graduating 6th-graders.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEAs

Interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, the three LEA superintendents, and the Fort McClellan garrison commander. Discussions were also held with parents of DDESS students, DDESS school board members, and representatives of the DDESS teachers' union.

Installation Positions

None of the representatives of the DDESS school or the installation favored transferring the Fort McClellan schools to a local school district. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent stressed the importance of meeting the special needs of military children—particularly those who are younger (elementary school-age). She noted that the Fort McClellan elementary school is well-equipped to accommodate transient military children. New students are quickly evaluated for special needs, placed in the appropriate classes, and included in extracurricular activities. This process takes place in an atmosphere where everyone—students, teachers, administrators, and parents—understands the difficulties inherent to frequent moves. The school also provides a strong support structure (i.e., counseling and support groups) for children whose parents are deployed or separated from the family due to some other military requirement.

The DDESS superintendent felt the resource levels in the neighboring LEAs would not be sufficient to support all the programs (e.g., special education, art, and music) currently provided by the Fort McClellan school.

Installation Commander. The Fort McClellan garrison commander viewed the installation school as a quality-of-life enhancement to military personnel living on-post. It was his opinion that the quality of the schools plays a substantial role in decisions associated with an assignment to Fort McClellan. He felt that many service members would choose “voluntary separation” rather than accept a Fort McClellan assignment if installation housing (and access to the installation school) could not be provided.

The garrison commander also noted that the elementary school provides a strong sense of community to the on-post population. Many non-school activities (e.g., Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and youth athletic programs) are supported by the school facilities.

The garrison commander pointed out that the school has a positive, supportive relationship with the chain of command on the installation. Problems that cannot be resolved within the school environment can be effectively dealt with through formal military channels, where other resources and options can be applied. The concern was expressed that these benefits of cooperation, support and quality-of-life would be lost if the on-post school were transferred to a local school district.

DDESS School Board Members and Parents of Students. The school board was primarily concerned about the effects a transfer would have on parental influence and school quality. In general, board members felt that if the schools were transferred, parents would no longer have control over their children's education. According to DDESS school board members, all three LEAs have residency requirements for participating in local school board elections that parents living on the installation cannot meet. Board members were also concerned that the quality of education at the installation school would diminish if the school were transferred to an LEA.

Parents characterized the loss of the school as the further erosion of the benefits “promised” to the active-duty military. Parents also felt that the standards (both educational and disciplinary) for the on-post school are higher than those at schools off the installation. Parents noted that the on-post school provides a safe, secure learning environment and that this school is among the main reasons parents choose to live on the installation.

Teachers’ Union. The primary concerns of the teachers’ union were employee status and job opportunities. Although it was anticipated that most DDESS teachers would be hired by the gaining school system, the lower LEA salaries would represent a substantial pay reduction for DDESS teachers.

LEA Positions

All three LEAs would be willing to accept the responsibility of educating the students who live on the installation. These LEAs, however, would not *actively* seek control of the Fort McClellan school, nor would they initiate any actions associated with transferring the school to their LEA. All were quite receptive to the idea of a transfer and felt that most barriers could be overcome. The planned closure of Fort McClellan was well-known to these superintendents, however, and probably contributed to their lack of concern about transfer issues in general.

In terms of which LEA would receive the Fort McClellan system, both Anniston and Jacksonville feel that the installation school should come under their control since they already educate some on-post students. Calhoun County is less enthusiastic about assuming this responsibility, and as such, is willing to let the DDESS students transfer to one of the two city LEAs.

Summary

Interviews at Fort McClellan and the surrounding LEAs revealed a number of factors that could facilitate or impede a transfer of the Fort McClellan DDESS to an LEA. These findings reiterate those of previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Although Fort McClellan is a closed post, the three surrounding LEAs already have access to the post to transport the students in grades 7 through 12.
- The majority (79%) of the military-connected students are educated in the three local school districts. This experience could be built upon in a transfer.
- A relatively small number of students (383) would be transferred.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Since Fort McClellan’s grade 7-12 students can attend one of three neighboring LEAs, each LEA has grounds for claiming jurisdiction over the Fort McClellan elementary school students. Although Calhoun County is willing to forego its claim to the Fort McClellan school system, a decision would have to be made regarding which of the remaining two LEAs should receive the DDESS students.
- Transferring the Fort McClellan school to one of the LEAs might eliminate the current option that allows the on-post grade 7-12 students to choose a LEA.

Fort Rucker, Alabama

The Installation

Fort Rucker is located in the southeast corner of Alabama, about 30 miles northwest of the city of Dothan. The installation borders Dale and Coffee Counties and is surrounded by the towns of Enterprise, Daleville, and Ozark.

Fort Rucker was established in 1942 and is the home of the Army Aviation Center—a major training installation. Fort Rucker provides all Army aviation flight training and all Air Force helicopter training. Military personnel from many foreign countries also receive training at Fort Rucker.

The population of Fort Rucker includes 6,030 active-duty personnel and 8,400 family members. There are nearly 1,600 family housing units (737 officer and 858 enlisted) located on the installation. About 45 percent of the family members stationed at Fort Rucker live on the installation. Because of Fort Rucker's training mission, the military population is quite transient, with an annual turn-over rate of about 40 percent. Fort Rucker employs approximately 6,200 local civilians, making it one of the area's largest employers.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The two Fort Rucker schools serve students from pre-school (age 4) through grade 6. The original elementary school (grades 1-6) was established in 1963 because local school districts were segregated. Prior to 1963, most of the on-post students attended Ozark city schools. A primary school, serving pre-kindergarten through grade 1, was built in 1973 to accommodate an expanding installation population. Table G.2 lists the current Fort Rucker DDESS schools and the grade ranges and enrollments for each school. The 1,102 students attending DDESS schools represent 36 percent of the 3,047 Fort Rucker-affiliated students.

Table G.2.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Fort Rucker

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Ft. Rucker Preschool: PK-1	474
Ft. Rucker Elementary School: 2-6	628
Total enrollment:	1,102

On-post 7th-12th graders have a choice of attending school in one of the three adjacent city local school districts: Enterprise, Daleville, or Ozark. Transportation is provided by the receiving school district. These grade 7-12 students represent approximately 25 percent of the on-post Fort Rucker students.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

If the DDESS schools were transferred to LEAs, five school systems might receive the Fort Rucker students. These neighboring school systems include Dale and Coffee Counties, as well as the independent school systems in the cities of Ozark and Daleville (both located in Dale County) and Enterprise (located in Coffee County). Data on these five LEAs are provided in Table G.3.

Table G.3.
Enrollment of School Districts Adjacent to Fort Rucker

Student Group	Adjacent School Districts											
	Dale Co. (7 schools)		Coffee Co. (6 schools)		Daleville (3 schools)		Ozark (6 schools)		Enterprise (10 schools)		Total (32 schools)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Military students living on the installation	0	0	0	0	159	11	67	2	146	3	372	3
Military students living off the installation	40	2	33	2	227	15	320	10	953	19	1,573	11
All Other Students	2,418	98	1,708	98	1,109	74	2,883	88	4,031	79	12,149	86
Total Enrollment:	2,458		1,741		1,495		3,270		5,130		14,094	

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Dale County currently educates only the 40 military-connected students that live (off-post) in the county. Although the Fort Rucker housing areas and DDESS schools are located within the jurisdictional boundaries of Dale County, the nearest Dale County school is located 20 miles from the installation. Because of this distance, Dale County does not educate any of the on-post students.

Coffee County also educates only the small number of military-connected students (38) that live in Coffee County (i.e., off-post). This county's closest school to Fort Rucker is 12 miles away.

The Daleville city school district, one of the smaller LEAs, is directly adjacent to Fort Rucker and is the closest LEA to on-post housing. As such, Daleville has a relatively high proportion (26%) of military-connected students and the largest number of on-post students attending an LEA (159 or 43%). The school system educates about 13 percent of the total military-connected students.

The Ozark city school system is also near the base and is one of the LEAs that on-post 7th-12th graders can attend. Twelve percent of the students in that LEA are military-connected. Approximately 18 percent of the on-post students who attend off-post schools do so in the Ozark LEA. The Ozark school district educates about 13 percent of the total military-connected student population.

The Enterprise city school district, another LEA that Fort Rucker secondary students can attend, is located about three miles from the installation and is the largest school district in the area. Most of the off-post military families live in the city of Enterprise, and military-connected students account for 22 percent of the enrollment in the district's schools. More than one-third (39%) of the on-post students who attend an LEA are enrolled in Enterprise schools. The Enterprise LEA has only 3

fewer students than does the Fort Rucker DDESS schools, and the LEA accounts for 36 percent of the total military-connected student population.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEAs

Individual interviews were conducted with the Fort Rucker schools superintendent, the installation commander, and each of the five local school district superintendents. In addition, discussions were held with the DDESS school board, Fort Rucker teachers' union representatives, and members of the Fort Rucker military staff.

Installation Positions

No installation or DDESS system representative supported transferring the two Fort Rucker schools to a local school district. Specific comments are presented below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent noted that the Fort Rucker school system provided a high quality education geared to the special needs of military families. The superintendent felt that the Fort Rucker staff are more experienced than are the local districts' staffs at meeting the special challenges presented by a transient, high-turnover student population. The Fort Rucker DDESS system has adopted procedures to evaluate and place incoming students quickly and with minimum disruption. Individual student sponsorship programs also assist students in transition to their new school environment.

The superintendent noted that the Fort Rucker schools are small and have achieved a high level of school-community cooperation. A sense of community is greatly valued by families and commanding officers, particularly in those situations where family members have to deploy on short-notice for extended periods.

In addition, the superintendent was concerned about how a transfer of schools would affect DDESS personnel (e.g., employment opportunities for DDESS staff and faculty, salary scales and credit for DDESS teaching experience, and transfer of retirement and other benefits accrued by the DDESS teachers).

Installation Commander. The installation commander indicated that the relationship between Fort Rucker and the surrounding communities was excellent. He further pointed out that deciding which LEA would receive responsibility for the Fort Rucker schools could be very difficult and could damage the relationship with the non-selected communities and school districts.

The commander was concerned that a transfer would appear to be a loss of family quality-of-life benefits. He noted that such perceptions usually degrade morale and personal readiness.

The commander also noted that the on-post school system is supported by the entire Fort Rucker command structure. He felt that this command focus provides a special efficiency that LEAs do not have. Problems can be quickly identified and resources or corrective actions can be applied to remedy situations before they become major issues.

Fort Rucker trains a large number of foreign students each year. The commander suggested that the on-post school system, as part of the total military community, provides a more comfortable atmosphere for the younger children of these foreign students.

DDESS School Board. DDESS school board members had concerns about military-parent representation on the LEA school board if a transfer took place. In Alabama, county school boards are elected, and city school boards are appointed by the city council. Since the Fort Rucker DDESS schools and housing are located within Dale County, on-base parents could only be involved in Dale County school board elections, and only if they were Alabama state residents. The DDESS school board felt this would result in a loss of governance and a loss of parental influence in the education of military children.

The impact of court-ordered busing in some of the local school districts was also discussed. DDESS school board members were concerned that Fort Rucker students might need to be transported to distant county schools to achieve appropriate student demographic mixes.

Several board members noted that the local districts do not have the resources to provide the same programs as the Fort Rucker DDESS schools. As a result, they were concerned that the high quality of education currently offered in the Fort Rucker schools would be compromised if a transfer were to occur.

LEA Positions

The five school districts that could be considered as possible recipients of the Fort Rucker school system unanimously supported the view that the current situation is working fine and that there is no reason to change it. Their comments and concerns about a transfer are summarized below.

- If the transfer took place, all five districts indicated they would need the Fort Rucker school buildings and “up-front” funding for the transition.
- Superintendents of the two county school systems, Dale and Coffee, felt that their facilities were located too far from Fort Rucker to make them viable recipients of the Fort Rucker system. Neither county currently educates any of the on-post children, and both have only a small number of off-post military students attending their district. However, the Dale County superintendent did feel some responsibility to accept a transfer of the Fort Rucker system since the DDESS facilities and on-post housing are within Dale County’s jurisdiction.
- Superintendents of the three city school districts (Daleville, Ozark, and Enterprise), all of which currently educate some of the on-post children, felt the present arrangement was fine. The superintendents commented that their district’s Federal Impact Aid (Type A funds) was adequate for educating on-post children; however, they also expressed apprehension that such funding may soon decline.
- School board representation of Fort Rucker parents who are not Alabama residents could not be accommodated under present Alabama law. There is currently an ex-officio military member of the Ozark city school board. The district superintendents did agree that, since Fort Rucker is such a major economic factor in the local communities, there would perhaps be some provision for “informal” influence.

Summary

Interviews at Fort Rucker and the adjacent school districts revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the Fort Rucker DDESS schools to an LEA. These findings are similar to those of previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Local districts already educate the majority (64%) of the Fort Rucker military-connected students, and could build on this experience.
- Fort Rucker is an open post. Local school buses come onto the installation for grade 7-12 students who attend schools in the three adjacent LEAs. Access is not a major issue at this installation.
- Local school district officials are satisfied with the federal Impact Aid they receive to educate military-connected students. If these per-student levels of Impact Aid were applied to the additional students the district(s) would receive, compensation would be adequate to offset increased local expenditures.
- Most LEA officials felt some form of school board representation for military parents could be accommodated, possibly in an informal or ex-officio capacity.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Fort Rucker's grade 7-12 students can attend one of three neighboring LEAs, and a fourth LEA has legal jurisdiction over the installation housing areas and DDESS facilities. Thus, a decision would have to be made regarding which of these four LEAs should receive the DDESS students.
- Upsetting the current arrangement for students in grades 7-12 by transferring them all to a single LEA could affect funding resources in the three city LEAs, perhaps instigating legal challenges.
- All of the candidate LEAs would require additional "transition" funding to implement a transfer.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

The Installation

Maxwell Air Force Base (AFB) is located on the northwestern edge of Montgomery, Alabama, in Montgomery County. The base is the home of the Air University, which is the Air Force's largest complex of professional schools. These schools include the Air War College, the Air Command and Staff College, the Squadron Officer School, and the Air Force Senior Noncommissioned Officers' Academy. Maxwell AFB also has jurisdiction over Gunther Annex, which is located about five miles from Maxwell AFB and houses three components of the Air University. However, there are no DDESS facilities on Gunther, and military family members living at Gunther have never been part the Maxwell DDESS system.

Maxwell AFB was first established in 1918 as an Army air base. During World War II, it was a pilot training center. In 1946, the base became an Air Force installation and the site of the Air University. The Air University's mission influences the characteristics of the military personnel assigned to Maxwell AFB. Nearly one-half of the base's 5,404 active-duty military members are officers. Since the average length of a training course at Maxwell is less than one year, the base experiences a high annual rate of personnel turn-over.

There are 7,500 family members assigned to Maxwell AFB, and 885 family housing units (382 officer and 503 enlisted) located on the installation. As an employer of nearly 4,400 local civilians, the base contributes substantially to the local economy.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The DDESS system at Maxwell AFB consists of one elementary school, established in 1963. It was started in response to segregation in the local schools. Maxwell Elementary School currently enrolls 450 students in kindergarten through grade 6. On-base students in grades 7-12 attend school in Montgomery County, with transportation provided by the county. Seventeen percent of the 2,726 publicly educated students affiliated with Maxwell AFB attend the Maxwell AFB DDESS school.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Because Maxwell AFB resides entirely in Montgomery County, the Montgomery County school district is the only LEA to be considered in DDESS transfer decisions. This city-county district includes Montgomery, the state capital and the third largest city in Alabama (city population of 180,000). The Montgomery County district is the fourth largest LEA in the state. Table G.4 provides enrollment statistics on the Montgomery County school district.

Montgomery County currently educates about 70 percent of the elementary and secondary students connected with Maxwell AFB (excluding students in private schools, which are widely used in this area). An additional 373 children of Maxwell AFB personnel live and attend school in nearby Autauga County. (Since Autauga County has no jurisdictional boundaries with Maxwell Air Force Base, it is not considered as a candidate to receive the base's DDESS system.)

Table G.4.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Maxwell Air Force Base

Student Group	Montgomery County (51 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Living On-Base	448	1
Military Living Off-Base	1,455	4
All Other Students	33,162	95
Total Enrollment:	35,065	

Because Montgomery County educates the on-base students in grades 7-12, the county educates essentially the same number of *on-base* students as does Maxwell Elementary School. Given the large size of Montgomery County, however, military-connected students represent only 5 percent of the total district enrollment. There is considerable interaction between the DDESS and Montgomery County schools.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Individual interviews were conducted with the Maxwell DDESS superintendent, the installation commander, and the Montgomery County superintendent.

Installation Positions

Neither the DDESS superintendent nor the base commander supported transferring the Maxwell DDESS school to Montgomery County. Specific comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The superintendent was concerned that the high standards of education currently provided at the DDESS school would not be maintained if a transfer took place. The superintendent also pointed out that a large proportion of the military personnel assigned to the base are officers who tend to be highly concerned about their children's education programs and opportunities.

The superintendent noted that Maxwell AFB's training mission results in a highly transient military population. As a result, Maxwell Elementary School has experienced an annual turnover rate as high as 50 percent. The superintendent believes that the DDESS staff and faculty, compared to those in Montgomery County, are more experienced and have better resources (testing, counseling, placement services, etc.) to meet the special challenges presented by a high-turnover student population.

The Maxwell DDESS superintendent also noted that Montgomery County remains under court order to comply with federal desegregation plans. The present desegregation plan allows a majority-to-minority transfer option, whereby students attending a school where their race is the majority may transfer to a school where their race is a minority. There is concern that in the event of a transfer, the higher quality DDESS school would attract enough additional students to require reassignment of some on-base students to off-base schools.

Installation Commander. Like the majority of other installation commanders with DDESS schools, the Maxwell AFB commander viewed the loss of the DDESS schools as a further erosion of the quality-of-life benefits afforded military personnel. He added that many officers attend the Air

University as geographic bachelors, primarily to avoid placing their children in the local schools. The commander noted that the Air Force career-advancement process requires that an officer receive several assignments at Maxwell AFB. The commander is concerned that if the DDESS school were transferred, many high quality officers would end their pursuit of an Air Force career rather than continue to be placed in voluntary separation situations.

LEA Positions

The LEA superintendent recognized the LEA's responsibility to educate Maxwell AFB students. However, he noted that the LEA is currently under-funded. As a result, funding above that anticipated by Impact Aid would be needed if the LEA were to be able to maintain its current education programs while assuming responsibility for the DDESS students. The superintendent noted that additional funding from the local community is not likely, since local voters do not support tax increases for education. LEA officials attribute this lack of public support to the large number of private schools in the area. LEA officials also felt that if the DDESS students were transferred to Montgomery County schools, many military parents would choose to enroll their children in private schools.

Summary

Interviews at Maxwell AFB and the Montgomery County school district revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the DDESS schools to the county. These findings are very similar to those of previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflict would arise.
- Montgomery County already educates a majority of the Maxwell AFB military-connected students, and the additional 450 DDESS elementary students would increase Montgomery County's total enrollment by only one percent. Montgomery County is willing to accept responsibility for these additional on-base students.
- Security and access concerns appear minimal. Although Maxwell AFB is a closed base, LEA school buses transport the on-base students in grades 7-12 to and from the off-base schools. Moreover, Maxwell Elementary School is located on the perimeter of the base. The installation boundary could be realigned to make the facility an off-base school, thereby minimizing security concerns.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Current compliance with court-ordered desegregation plans creates a situation that could influence school assignments and jeopardize Maxwell Elementary School's neighborhood school status.
- The Montgomery County LEA would require funds in excess of the amount anticipated under the current Impact Aid program.
- Montgomery County schools do not appear to have much local support. Revenues are barely sufficient to maintain even the full range of basic education programs. Personnel stationed at Maxwell AFB are likely to strongly oppose sending their children to schools that are under-funded and poorly supported by their local community.

Fort Benning, Georgia

The Installation

Fort Benning is located nine miles south of Columbus, Georgia. It covers land in two Georgia counties—Muscogee and Chattahoochee. Muscogee County is one of the most populous counties in the state and includes the city of Columbus. Overall, Fort Benning is oriented toward Columbus. Most service members who live off the installation live either in Columbus or in other parts of Muscogee County. Chattahoochee County garners very little advantage from the military installation. It is sparsely populated; most of its land (80%) is either on Fort Benning or is owned or leased by timber companies.

Established in 1918, Fort Benning is a major training installation. For example, it is the home of the Army Infantry Center and School as well as the Army School of the Americas. In addition, several brigade-size Army units are stationed at Fort Benning. Because it is primarily a training installation, Fort Benning's military population is highly transient; many tours of duty last less than a year. The installation is an open post with unrestricted access.

The population at Fort Benning includes 19,615 active-duty and 21,705 family members. There are over 4,000 family housing units (560 officer and 3,530 enlisted) located on the installation. Approximately 40 percent of the family members stationed at Fort Benning live on-post. Average waiting time for on-post housing is six months with some variation depending on the time of year and the rank of the military sponsor.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The Fort Benning school system was founded in 1921, approximately three years after the installation opened. The school system was funded through tuition payments and local fund-raising activities until it was converted to a Section 6 school when Congress created the program in 1950.

Fort Benning has seven DDESS schools which provide education to 3,164 students in kindergarten through grade 8. These 3,164 students comprise 46 percent of the 6,822 Fort Benning-affiliated students attending schools on or off the installation. Table G.5 lists these schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments. All of the on-post children in grades 9-12 attend school in Muscogee County. Although some of the on-post high school students attend a liberal arts magnet school in Columbus, the majority of the students attend Spencer High School, which is located adjacent to the installation. The Muscogee County school district provides the transportation from the Fort Benning housing areas to Spencer High School. Approximately 50 percent of the students attending Spencer High School live on the installation. The Fort Benning school system is working with Muscogee County to ease students' transition from the on-base middle school to the local high school.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Muscogee County and Chattahoochee County are the two LEAs that could be considered as possible recipients of the Fort Benning DDESS system. Although adjacent, Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties are very different. Muscogee County operates a K-12 education system in 54 schools with over 29,000 students. Chattahoochee County has one school (K-8) with 461 students.

Table G.5.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Fort Benning

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
McBride School (K-3)	361
Loyd School (K-5)	325
Stowers School (K-5)	592
White School (K-5)	370
Dexter School (K-5)	289
Wilson School (K-5)	420
Faith School (6-8)	807
Total enrollment:	3,164

Chattahoochee high school students (about 100) attend Spencer High School in Muscogee County. The costs of educating these students is paid partly by Chattahoochee (in the form of tuition payments) and partly by the State of Georgia. State officials favor a merger of the two school systems. However, Muscogee officials see no benefit to absorbing the Chattahoochee system since Chattahoochee County has a very limited funding base. Interactions among the three school systems are frequent since both Chattahoochee and Fort Benning send their high school students to Muscogee County's Spencer High School.

Table G.6 presents comparative statistics on the two LEAs. Because most of the off-post service members live in Muscogee County, this county educates about one-half (53 percent) of the military-connected students. Approximately 12 percent of the Muscogee students are military dependents. If responsibility for educating the 3,164 DDESS students were transferred to Muscogee County, military-connected students would constitute 21 percent of the LEA enrollment. Chattahoochee County enrolls only 27 military dependents—all of whom live off the installation.

Table G.6.
Enrollment of School Districts Adjacent to Fort Benning

Student Group	Muscogee County (54 schools)		Chattahoochee Co. (1 school)		Total (55 schools)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Military Students						
Living On the Installation	540	2	0	0	540	2
Living Off the Installation	3,064	10	27	6	3,091	10
All Other Students	26,073	88	434	94	26,507	88
Total Enrollment:	29,677		461		30,138	

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEAs

Separate interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, a representative of the Fort Benning command group, and the superintendents of both adjacent LEAs. Discussions were also held with teachers' union representatives for the DDESS system, the DDESS school board, and parents of DDESS students.

Installation Positions

None of the installation-affiliated interviewees favored a transfer of the DDESS schools to a neighboring LEA. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. According to the DDESS superintendent, there are three main reasons for not transferring the Fort Benning schools to an LEA. First, the on-post schools are neighborhood schools. Virtually all of the students can walk to school. The one exception is the Loyd Elementary School; all students are bused there. The superintendent was concerned that a transfer of schools would mean that students from the surrounding county would be bused onto the installation and/or students from the installation would be sent to off-post schools.

Second, the superintendent noted that the Fort Benning schools are uniquely suited to meet the needs of the transient military child. New students are quickly evaluated for special needs, placed in the appropriate classes, and included in extracurricular activities. This process takes place in an atmosphere where everyone—students, teachers, administrators, and parents—understands the difficulties inherent in frequent moves and works with the new students to ease their transition. In addition, students are provided with the necessary support structure (i.e., counseling and support groups) to deal with parents who are deployed or otherwise separated from their children.

Finally, the superintendent pointed out that the DDESS system benefits from a very good relationship with the installation. An example of this relationship is an incident that took place during the 1994-95 school year. One of the school buildings needed a new roof. The Commanding General identified a barracks that could serve as a temporary school, created an integrated plan to move the school, and accomplished the move over the Christmas holidays. This move was accomplished with almost no advance warning and the students missed only two days of school.

Installation Command. The comments made on behalf of the Fort Benning command generally echoed the feelings of the DDESS superintendent (in particular the issue of busing). Several additional issues were mentioned—quality of life, building maintenance and control, parent involvement, and chain of command—each of which is described below.

Quality of Life. A major issue raised by the command was that the DDESS schools improve the quality of life of the soldiers stationed at Fort Benning. The representative suggested that it was in the best interest of the soldiers and their families that the DDESS schools remain separate from the LEA. Transferring DDESS schools would erode another benefit offered to service members and would negatively affect readiness.

Building Maintenance and Control. If a neighboring county took over the on-base schools, the LEA would have to perform all maintenance. The buildings are currently in good repair, but there is concern that the level of maintenance would diminish if the schools were transferred.

Parent Involvement. The DDESS school board is very strong. There is concern that few (if any) parents living on the installation could meet the residency requirements to serve on the local school boards. Thus, military parents would not be able to influence the schools in the same way they can with the installation schools.

Chain of Command. The commanders' representative feels that the DDESS schools' strong, supportive relationship with the installation's chain of command helps maintain morale and family quality-of-life. For example, if a problem with a DDESS student is not resolved within the school environment, resolution can be sought through military channels where other resources and options can be applied.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board was primarily concerned about parental influence and school quality. In general, they felt that if the Fort Benning schools were transferred, parents would no longer have control over their children's education. The current arrangement for Spencer High School allows an installation liaison officer to present parent concerns to Muscogee school officials. The DDESS school board also felt that parent volunteerism would not be welcomed in surrounding counties the way it is at Fort Benning.

There was a widespread concern among the board members that the education quality of the on-post schools would diminish if the schools were transferred to an LEA. They stated that the standardized test scores of on-post students are very high. The board did not feel that LEA schools had the resources or infrastructure to duplicate these results.

Other issues important to the school board that also were brought up by others on the installation included the unique ability of the on-post schools to work with the whole family and to teach the military child.

Teachers' Union. The primary concerns of the teachers' union were salary, job security, and retirement. Teachers in both LEAs are paid at a lower level than those on the installation. Additionally, it is not clear that Fort Benning teachers would be able to buy into the LEA retirement plans at a level that would equal the benefits accumulated in the Federal system. All of these issues would need to be resolved through negotiations between the DDESS system, the teachers' union, and the receiving county.

In addition, the teachers' union was concerned that a transfer would diminish the sense of community that currently exists in the on-post schools. For example, the extra counseling that the DDESS schools provided to students when Fort Benning soldiers were deployed during the Gulf War would most likely not be available in the local counties.

Other issues that were raised by the union were the high quality of education at Fort Benning schools, the safe environment of the schools, and their strong ties to the community—features the union feared would be lost in a transfer.

Parents of Fort Benning Students. Parents characterized the loss of the schools as a further erosion of the benefits they receive as service members. They feel that the standards for the on-post schools are higher than those in the local community and that the Fort Benning schools are one of the major reasons service members elect to live on-post.

Overall, parents reiterated many of the issues expressed by other groups: the advantage of having community schools that are set up to address the unique needs of the military child, and the command support for the day-to-day operation of the schools.

LEA Positions

Since the Fort Benning housing areas straddle two counties, a transfer would involve deciding which county LEA would assume responsibility for the on-post students. It is generally agreed, however, that all of the students should attend schools in the same county.

Both the Muscogee and Chattahoochee school districts are willing to accept the responsibility of educating the on-post students. However, both are operating at full capacity and would need the on-post school buildings to be included in any transfer. In addition, as Impact Aid payments have diminished substantially in recent years, both LEA superintendents feel that adequate compensation is a critical issue regarding transfer. Neither county is willing to ask their local taxpayers to assume the cost of educating the students who currently reside on Fort Benning. Issues specific to the individual LEAs are summarized below.

Muscogee County. Muscogee County has a close relationship with the Fort Benning schools, as they educate the on-post high school students. The county feels that the DDESS students receive a good education, and that incoming high school students are well-prepared.

The county is growing by approximately 300-500 students per year due to local growth in light industries. As a result, the school district is currently operating with 124 portable classrooms. The recent defeat of a board referendum suggests that construction of additional facilities is unlikely.

Chattahoochee County. The Chattahoochee County officials stated that they would not—at this time—actively seek ownership of the Fort Benning schools. They did, however, wish to be included in any transfer discussions for what they considered their “fair share” of the DDESS students. They pointed out that the jurisdictional boundaries of Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties extend onto the installation and that these boundaries divide not only the on-post student population but also the school facilities. The LEA wants to be considered as a possibility for the Fort Benning students rather than being dismissed as too small. Chattahoochee County officials were concerned that Muscogee County would use the acquisition of the Fort Benning school system as an opportunity to merge with and take over the entire Chattahoochee County.

Chattahoochee County officials stated that a significant up-front payment from the Federal government would be required to accomplish a transfer.

Summary

Data collection at Fort Benning and the surrounding LEAs revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the Fort Benning DDESS system to an LEA. These findings are similar to those of previous studies (GAO, 1986; Bodilly et al., 1988) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Muscogee County already educates nearly all (99 percent) of the military dependents living off the installation and all of the Fort Benning high school students. This experience could be built on in a transfer.

- Access to the on-post schools and students could be accomplished easily because Fort Benning is an open installation. Muscogee County school buses already have access to Fort Benning to transport high school students.
- Muscogee County is a large LEA with sufficient administrative capacity to absorb the DDESS facilities and Fort Benning students.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Fort Benning housing and DDESS facilities fall within two county school jurisdictions. Although all parties agree that all on-post students should attend the same LEA, the determination of which LEA would receive the on-post students is unresolved. A transfer to Muscogee County, the most obvious choice, could instigate the take-over of Chattahoochee County by Muscogee County, which could in turn harm relations between Fort Benning and Chattahoochee County residents.

Fort Stewart, Georgia

The Installation

Fort Stewart is located in Liberty County, Georgia, 40 miles southwest of Savannah, in the state's southeast coastal region. Hinesville, the county seat, is the closest town to the main installation facilities and housing areas. Fort Stewart is the largest military installation east of the Mississippi River and occupies nearly 50 percent of Liberty County. Fort Stewart is the area's largest employer and most of the population growth in the local community has been directly tied to the installation.

Fort Stewart was established in 1940 and has since become the home of the 24th Infantry Division (Mechanized) and other elements of the nation's Rapid Deployment Force. The installation supports 16,106 active-duty personnel and 24,397 family members. There are over 2,400 family housing units (177 officer and 2,262 enlisted) located on the installation. On-post housing is considered limited; only about one-third of the married service members stationed at Fort Stewart live on the installation.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The Fort Stewart DDESS system was established in 1963 because the local school district was not integrated. At the time of its founding, approximately 350 students were enrolled in grades 1-6. Today, the two schools serve 1,663 students in kindergarten through grade 6, all of whom live close enough to either walk or bike to school. These 1,663 students represent 33 percent of the 4,996 Fort Stewart-connected students enrolled in on- or off-post schools. Fort Stewart students in grades 7-12 attend Liberty County schools on buses provided by Liberty County. Table G.7 provides a listing of the Fort Stewart DDESS schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments.

Table G.7.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Fort Stewart

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Brittin Elementary School (K-6)	754
Diamond Elementary School (K-6)	909
Total enrollment:	1,663

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Liberty County is the only school district adjacent to Fort Stewart. As such, it would be the only LEA accepting responsibility for the Fort Stewart students if the DDESS schools were transferred. Table G.8 provides current enrollment statistics for the Liberty County school district.

The Liberty County LEA educates about two-thirds (67%) of the students whose parents are assigned to Fort Stewart. Approximately 39 percent of Liberty County students are military dependents.

Table G.8.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Fort Stewart

Student Group	Liberty County (11 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military living on the installation	554	6
Military living off the installation	2,799	32
All Other Students	5,281	61
Total Enrollment:	8,634	

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Enrollment in the LEA increases by about 400 students each year, much of which is directly attributable to Fort Stewart. The student turnover rate, also largely due to Fort Stewart, is approximately 300 students per month.

Because Fort Stewart's grade 7-12 students attend school in Liberty County, there is considerable opportunity for interaction between the two school systems. One result of this interaction is the alignment of Fort Stewart educational programs with those of Liberty County to ease the transition of the 7th-graders into the LEA schools.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Separate interviews were held with the Fort Stewart DDESS superintendent, the Fort Stewart installation commander, DDESS school board members, and Liberty County LEA officials.

Installation Positions

The representatives of the Fort Stewart DDESS system, installation commander, or school board members were not in favor of transferring the on-post schools to the Liberty County LEA. The comments and concerns raised by these individuals are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent raised several concerns about a potential transfer. Foremost was a concern regarding faculty salary and retirement. Liberty County faculty earn salaries that are considerably lower than those of the Fort Stewart DDESS staff. In addition, provision would need to be made to allow Fort Stewart teachers to participate in the Georgia state teacher retirement fund without suffering a loss in their DDESS retirement program. This provision might require a significant initial payment that would have to be negotiated as part of the transfer process.

The superintendent noted that family members expect a high level of support from the Fort Stewart DDESS schools. This support includes accommodating a highly transient student population and providing resources and counseling for students who have one or more parents deployed on short-notice military missions. There is concern that this support would diminish if the schools were transferred.

The superintendent noted that parents who live on Fort Stewart typically are not residents of Liberty County. Therefore, those parents could not participate in elections or serve on the Liberty County school board. In addition, residents of the installation would not have a voting base in other local

elections that have a fundamental impact on issues such as local education funding, school districting, and education programs and curricula.

Another concern was that children would be bused from the LEA onto the installation. The superintendent felt that the on-post schools draw strength from their homogeneity and that this strength would be diminished by adding children to the schools who do not live on the installation.

The superintendent also noted that the Fort Stewart DDESS schools align their school calendar with the military training calendar. Thus, the DDESS schools are in a better position (than are LEA schools) to accommodate students who miss school for military-related reasons (e.g., a mid-year change in assignment or a visit to relatives prior to an extended overseas assignment). Students in Georgia must attend school a certain number of days each year to receive credit for that year and be promoted to the next grade. In some instances, the DDESS schools provide assignments and study materials to allow students to earn school credit for days spent during military-related absences. This accommodation allows on-post students to fulfill their attendance requirements. Liberty County schools are unable to provide these individualized accommodations.

Finally, the superintendent noted that Fort Stewart has been designated a special assignment location for service members with exceptional family members. Military personnel with such family members receive special priority to live on-post. According to the superintendent, the DDESS educational services for exceptional family members exceed those offered in the local school district. For example, the DDESS school system provides prompt assessment and placement services for students with exceptional needs. There is a feeling that the local school district could not perform these functions as effectively.

Installation Command. The concerns of the installation commander were similar to those of the DDESS superintendent. The commander emphasized the high readiness levels for short-notice deployment among soldiers stationed at Fort Stewart. As a result, the mission of the on-post schools has evolved over the years from one of providing integrated education to providing a safe, supportive environment for children of service members assigned to units with rapid, limited-notice deployment operations. The Fort Stewart schools provide a unique mix of support and counseling. As a result, a deployed parent has confidence that his/her child is in a program that focuses on educational objectives while remaining sensitive to family separations brought on by military requirements. There is a general feeling that the Liberty County schools would be unable to provide this type of support—a situation that the installation commander believes could impair the personal readiness of individual soldiers.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board reiterated many of the concerns expressed by other Fort Stewart representatives. Overall, the board is highly satisfied with the current DDESS system and believes that it provides a better education than that offered by Liberty County. Transfer issues specifically mentioned by the DDESS school board included quality of life, child placement, community support, and the use of military spouses as teachers. These are discussed below.

Quality of Life. The school board felt that the Fort Stewart schools are an important component of the overall benefit package available to the military family member. They felt that transferring the on-post schools to the LEA would mean the loss of a benefit that improves military quality of life.

Child Placement. The transient nature of a military lifestyle results in children arriving at Fort Stewart throughout the school year. The Fort Stewart DDESS staff and faculty are well experienced

with this environment and have developed special procedures to evaluate and place incoming students into the Fort Stewart system quickly and with minimum disruption.

Community Support. The Fort Stewart military community is very responsive to the needs of the DDESS school system. There is significant involvement by individual Fort Stewart military units, as well as a high level of individual volunteerism in the schools. There is a concern that this involvement would not be actively welcomed if the on-post schools were transferred to Liberty County.

Military Spouses as Teachers. The DDESS school system hires qualified spouses to teach in the Fort Stewart schools. These military family members are perceived to contribute greatly to the overall quality of and special programs offered by the Fort Stewart school system. The DDESS school board expressed concern that these spouses would not be afforded similar employment opportunities in the LEA.

LEA Positions

The primary transfer issue raised by Liberty County school officials was funding. District officials understand that if transfer were to take place, the district would receive state and federal funding for the additional students. These Federal funds, however, (most likely in the form of Federal Impact Aid) would have to be sufficient to cover the local share (11-12% of overall costs) of educating the additional Fort Stewart students. Forward funding or some type of special advanced transition funds would be needed to help prepare the LEA to receive the additional students. The LEA officials noted that it would be unfair to burden the residents of Liberty County with the increased cost of educating students residing on Fort Stewart.

Other issues mentioned included busing and school district growth. Currently, all school districts in Georgia remain under court-ordered desegregation. To maintain a racial balance in Liberty County schools, all new schools must be built on the perimeter of the city of Hinesville. The location of these schools results in some children being transported great distances to school. Although he desired otherwise, the district superintendent could not guarantee that the Fort Stewart students would not have to be bused. The LEA superintendent also reserved the right to bus off-post students onto the installation in order to alleviate over-crowding.

The superintendent reported that over the last several years, the school district has been growing at a rate of 400 students (or one school) per year, and that generally, the tax base has expanded commensurate with this growth. As a result, the Liberty County LEA would need all the Fort Stewart DDESS facilities as well as most of the DDESS teachers. Whether the LEA assumed ownership or long-term leasing of the DDESS buildings, funding arrangements (in addition to Impact Aid) would be required to cover the costs of maintaining and providing capital improvements to the on-post buildings. The superintendent is uncertain, however, how much of the DDESS administration and support staff would be required.

Summary

Interviews at Fort Stewart and the adjacent Liberty County school district revealed several factors that could facilitate or impede any future transfer of the DDESS schools to the LEA. These factors are similar to those found by previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflicts would arise.
- Fort Stewart is an open post, and Liberty County already transports on-post students in grades 7-12. Access issues should be minimal.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- The LEA might use the DDESS schools to alleviate overcrowding in Liberty County schools and thus bus off-post students to the Fort Stewart facilities. The LEA might also bus the on-post students to schools off the installation to meet court-ordered desegregation requirements.
- Federal Impact Aid funds would have to be sufficient to cover the LEA's local contribution to student per-pupil expenditures. In addition, the LEA would require sufficient up-front "transition" funding before accepting the additional DDESS students.
- In the event the LEA assumed ownership or long-term leasing of the DDESS buildings, funding arrangements (in addition to Impact Aid) would be required to cover the costs of maintaining and providing capital improvements to the on-post buildings.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia

The Installation

Robins Air Force Base (AFB) is located in central Georgia. It is in Houston County, approximately 18 miles south of Macon. The base is the home of the Air Logistics Center and is the largest single industrial complex in the state of Georgia. As an employer of approximately 13,000 local civilians, Robins Air Force Base contributes substantially to the area's economy.

The Robins AFB population includes 4,760 active-duty personnel and 6,404 military family members. There are 1,394 family housing units (245 officer and 1,149 enlisted) located on the base. Robins AFB is a closed base; public access is restricted.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

Robins AFB opened its own elementary school in 1963 because the local school district was having difficulty absorbing the base students and implementing desegregation plans. On-base junior and senior high school students have always attended Houston County schools. Houston County buses these students from the installation to the county schools. The current Robins DDESS system is comprised of two elementary schools that enroll 890 students. Table G.9 provides a listing of these schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments. The 890 DDESS students constitute 38 percent of the 2,325 Robins AFB-affiliated students.

Table G.9.

Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Robins Air Force Base

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Linwood Elementary School (K-6)	408
Robins Elementary School (K-6)	482
Total enrollment:	890

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

As the only adjacent local educational agency (LEA), Houston County would be the only school district to accept responsibility for educating Robins AFB elementary school students if the DDESS schools were transferred. Table G.10 provides current enrollment statistics on the Houston County school district.

Although the Houston County LEA educates almost two-thirds (62%) of all Robins AFB-connected students, only 9 percent of Houston County students are military dependents. Transferring the DDESS students to Houston County would increase the Houston school district size by about six percent, and increase its proportion of military-connected students from 9 percent to 14 percent.

The Houston County school district is currently experiencing considerable growth which can be directly attributed to growth at Robins Air Force Base. The county's 1995-96 enrollment

Table G.10.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Robins Air Force Base

Student Group	Houston County (26 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Living On-Base	386	2
Military Living Off-Base	1,049	7
All Other Students	14,448	91
Total Enrollment:	15,883	

increased by 1,000 students over the previous year, and the anticipated growth for the 1996-97 school year is 1,200-2,000 students. Future growth is projected to stabilize at 400-650 students per year. Fortunately, commensurate with this growth has been the construction of single family homes. Increased local property taxes from this construction provides adequate funding for increased school enrollments.

The Houston County school district is currently building two middle schools, scheduled to open in Fall 1996. These new schools will allow the district to eliminate the 156 portable classrooms currently in use. In addition, the county has recently implemented a full-day program for four-year-olds.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

The site visit included individual interviews with the superintendent of the Robins DDESS system, the superintendent of the local LEA, and the installation commander. Discussions were also held with members of the Robins DDESS school board.

Installation Positions

No installation or DDESS school representative favored transferring the two Robins AFB DDESS schools to Houston County. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent felt that the Houston County schools could not provide the special services associated with a highly transient military student population (e.g., testing, counseling, and placement services).

The superintendent noted that the DDESS schools enjoy a high level of parent involvement. He suggested that much of this involvement is attributed to the strong support of the military command, the concern military parents have for the education of their children, and the many opportunities provided in a neighborhood school system. Many community programs revolve around the on-base schools. The DDESS staff and faculty are viewed as members of the military community, much like the many other Department of Defense civilian employees on the base.

Installation Commander. The installation commander is very satisfied with the current situation and would not favor a transfer of the two on-base schools. The commander feels that these schools provide a strong sense of community to the on-base military environment. The schools are neighborhood schools that enjoy a high level of parent involvement and volunteerism. The school buildings/facilities also support other community activities (e.g., Boy/Girl Scout meetings, community athletic activities).

Security was one of the installation commander's main concerns. Robins AFB is a closed facility with restricted public access due to concern for the security of base operations and property. Currently, only one of the schools is in a controlled access area. The other DDESS school could be included in a secure area of the base as a result of base growth caused by the realignment and closure of other bases.

Concerns regarding the future of the DDESS staff were also raised. Personnel issues such as employment opportunities, tenure, retirement, and salary comparability would need to be resolved.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board voiced concerns in the following five areas: parental influence, base security, transience of students, busing, and class size.

Parental Influence. The board is concerned that parents living on the installation will lose the influence they currently have in the education of their children. Membership on the local school board is presently through election. Most of the military members assigned to Robins AFB are not residents of Houston County or the state of Georgia and would therefore be ineligible to participate in school board elections. Houston County's offer to create a liaison position to represent the concerns of military parents received mixed reviews.

Security. DDESS board members noted that Robins AFB's mission requires a very high level of security. Base security requirements and the access needs of the Houston County LEA would seem to be in direct conflict with each other.

Transient Students. Military children relocate frequently, often completing their first 12 years of education in as many as five different school systems. The DDESS board noted that DDESS administrators and instructional staff are well experienced in accommodating these students. The DDESS schools are well resourced (e.g., diagnostic testing, counseling, and placement services) to evaluate and place in-coming students quickly. Student sponsorship programs also help alleviate transition anxieties.

Busing. DDESS board members are concerned that the LEA may change student school assignments. On-base children could be transported to off-base county schools, or children from the surrounding area could be bused onto the installation. Although there would be legitimate reasons for doing so (e.g., to relieve overcrowding), DDESS board members felt that such actions could deteriorate the concept of neighborhood schools.

Class Size. The DDESS school board pointed out that Houston County student-teacher ratios are higher than DDESS ratios. Smaller class sizes are perceived as one aspect of a higher quality of education.

LEA Positions

Houston County school officials voiced two major concerns regarding a potential transfer of the DDESS schools—money and facilities.

Money. Houston County places minimal reliance on Federal Impact Aid funding. For example, the district does not incorporate Impact Aid funds into the school-year budget until these funds have actually been received. The district also stated that current and projected funding levels for Impact

Aid are substantially less than what would be needed to accept responsibility for the additional Robins AFB students. In addition, start-up or transition expenses would have to be met.

Facilities. The Houston County school district is quite large and, *under normal circumstances*, might be able to absorb the relatively small number of additional Robins AFB students. However, substantial growth in student enrollment has caused most county facilities to become critically overcrowded. The Robins on-base DDESS facilities would be required before the LEA could accept responsibility for educating the additional Robins students. Houston County would prefer ownership of the buildings and would accept full responsibility for upkeep and maintenance.

Summary

Interviews at Robins AFB and the Houston County school district revealed a number of factors which could either facilitate or impede the decision to transfer the DDESS schools to the Houston County district. These findings are similar to those presented in previous studies of the DoD-operated schools (GAO, 1986; Bodilly et al., 1988). A summary of factors that would facilitate or impede the transfer decision is presented below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflict would arise.
- The Robins DDESS system is very small compared to the Houston County LEA and, if the Robins DDESS facilities were part of the transfer agreement, could be easily absorbed by the county.
- Houston County already educates all the Robins junior and senior high school students and nearly two-thirds of all military-connected students. They could build on this experience in a transfer.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Funds in addition to Impact Aid would be required to cover the initial costs of transferring the DDESS schools. Funds would also be needed to cover the long-term costs of educating the Robins AFB students.
- Robins AFB is a limited access facility. One of the DDESS school buildings is located in a “controlled access” area, making LEA access to this school problematic.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky

The Installation

Fort Campbell is located approximately 45 miles northwest of Nashville, Tennessee, and sits astride the Kentucky-Tennessee border near the town of Clarksville, Tennessee. The installation extends into four counties: Christian and Trigg in Kentucky, and Montgomery and Stewart in Tennessee. The installation's family housing and the DDESS schools are located in Christian County, Kentucky, and Montgomery County, Tennessee. Because of its close proximity to Clarksville, Tennessee, the installation is more economically and socially oriented to Clarksville and Montgomery County in Tennessee than to Christian County, Kentucky. Fort Campbell is a closed post.

Fort Campbell was established in 1942 and is the home of the Army's 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault). The installation includes 22,859 active-duty personnel and 38,251 family members. There are over 4,000 family housing units (800 officer and 3,353 enlisted) located on the installation. Approximately 40 percent of the married family members stationed at Fort Campbell live on-post. Average waiting time for on-post housing is 6 to 9 months.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

From 1942 to 1951, children living on Fort Campbell were educated by the city of Clarksville in an on-post school. In 1951, with the creation of Section 6 schools, the installation began independent operations for elementary and middle school children; high school students attended school in Clarksville. In 1962, the city of Clarksville transferred responsibility for the on-post high school students to the newly built Fort Campbell High School.

There are currently seven DDESS schools on Fort Campbell; five are located in Kentucky and two are in Tennessee. However, all on-post schools function as if they were located in Kentucky. All teachers in the Fort Campbell schools must have Kentucky certification, and all schools were built to Kentucky codes. The schools follow the Kentucky curriculum and compete athletically and scholastically with Kentucky schools. Table G.11 lists the Fort Campbell schools with their grade ranges and enrollments. The 4,297 DDESS students are 44 percent of the 9,668 Fort Campbell-affiliated students living on or off the installation.

Table G.11.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Fort Campbell

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Barkley Elementary School (PK-5)	707
Jackson Elementary School (PK-5)	818
Lincoln Elementary School (PK-5)	707
Marshall Elementary School (PK-5)	705
Wassom Middle School (6-8)	435
Mahaffey Middle School (6-8)	342
Ft. Campbell High School (9-12)	583
Total enrollment:	4,297

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Montgomery County, Tennessee, and Christian County, Kentucky, are the two LEAs adjacent to Fort Campbell that could be considered possible recipients of the Fort Campbell students. Although both school districts provide a full K-12 program, Montgomery County is considerably larger with almost twice the enrollment of Christian County. Table G.12 presents comparative data on these two LEAs.

Table G.12.

Enrollment of School Districts Adjacent to Fort Campbell

Student Group	Montgomery County, TN (23 schools)		Christian County, KY (17 schools)		Total (40 schools)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Military Students						
Living On the Installation	13 ¹	<1	0	0	13	<1
Living Off the Installation	4,357	25	1,001	11	5,358	20
All Other Students	13,072	75	8,428	89	21,500	80
Total Enrollment:	17,442		9,429		26,871	

¹ Children of families occupying on-post transient quarters but not on the waiting list for on-post housing (and therefore not eligible to attend the Fort Campbell DDESS schools).

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Because most off-post service members reside in Clarksville or other parts of Montgomery County, the Montgomery County school system accounts for about 81 percent of the total off-post military student enrollment. Montgomery County enrolls slightly more military students than does the Fort Campbell DDESS system (4,370 vs. 4,297, respectively), accounting for approximately 45 percent of the total military school-age population. If the 4,297 DDESS students were transferred to the Montgomery County LEA, it would raise their enrollment of military-connected students from 25 percent to 40 percent. If all DDESS students were transferred to the Christian County LEA, the proportion of military-connected students would rise from 11 percent to 39 percent.

Because the Fort Campbell schools cover grades K-12, this DDESS system has had few formal interactions with either of the two neighboring LEAs.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEAs

Individual interviews were conducted with the superintendents of the Fort Campbell DDESS system, Montgomery County, and Christian County. An interview was also conducted with a member of the Fort Campbell command group, and group meetings were held with DDESS school principals, the DDESS school board, and representatives of the DDESS teachers' union.

Installation Positions

None of the representatives of the Fort Campbell installation or the DDESS schools were in favor of transferring the DDESS schools to one of the neighboring LEAs. The concerns raised by these groups are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent felt that a transfer would not maintain the high quality of education currently provided in the Fort Campbell DDESS system. The superintendent cited several services and resources that are available in the DDESS system but not in the LEAs.

- The DDESS system provides approximately one computer for every two students. Fiber optic local area networks (LANs) are currently being installed in the schools. In both Tennessee and Kentucky, the goal is to provide one computer for every nine students.
- On-post schools provide a wide variety of courses that include 13 advanced placement classes and instruction in a large number of foreign languages. Extracurricular activities are also well represented, with competitive teams for virtually every sport.
- There is a full-time guidance counselor in each of the seven installation schools. This staffing is particularly helpful in accommodating the special needs of a highly transient student population. This service is also useful for students whose military sponsors are assigned to rapid deployment units such as the 101st Airborne Division.
- The LEAs are viewed as providing a minimum level of services for students with special needs; the DDESS schools provide a higher level of service. All special needs students living on-post are served by the Fort Campbell schools.

The Fort Campbell schools receive a significant level of support from the military community. For example, military units are informally aligned to provide volunteer assistance to each on-post school. Service members in these units donate time in the classrooms and provide volunteer labor for projects such as building playgrounds and moving furniture. Additionally, the Commanding General appoints several officers as advisors to the schools. Although these advisors are not voting members of the school board, they attend school board meetings and provide input. The Fort Campbell Garrison Commander serves as a liaison linking the Fort Campbell schools and the Fort Campbell Commanding General.

The DDESS superintendent felt there was a higher level of discipline in the Fort Campbell schools than in the surrounding counties. This difference was attributed to the homogeneous (military) enrollment of the student body. The superintendent noted that because discipline is not a significant problem in the Fort Campbell schools, the DDESS staff and faculty are able to devote a larger portion of their time and resources to educating students.

The superintendent believes that site-based management contributes to a better education system. The Fort Campbell schools operate on a site-based management concept, as do the Christian County schools. At Fort Campbell, site-based management is implemented through school-level committees composed of parents, teachers, the school principal, and a representative of the Fort Campbell Command. The Montgomery County schools do not have site-based management.

Installation Command. The installation commander's representative stressed that it was critical that the best interests of the children and their parents be foremost in any decision to transfer the schools. The commander's representative believes that the on-post schools provide quality education for Fort Campbell students and that the schools should remain as part of the DDESS system. Additional issues raised included the multi-jurisdiction of the two LEAs and states, providing access to the DDESS facilities, and parent representation on local school boards.

When discussing the issue of access to the DDESS facilities, the representative pointed out that the mission of the 101st Airborne Division requires Fort Campbell to operate as a closed installation. Access to the Fort Campbell DDESS facilities by the neighboring counties could be an impediment to transfer.

DDESS School Board. Members of the DDESS school board noted that they had not received any positive feedback when discussing the subject of transfer with parents. While several of the school board's concerns had been previously raised by others (e.g., ability to serve the unique needs of the military child, higher level of resources available to the DDESS schools, and the level of services available for exceptional family members), the board cited additional concerns related to quality of life, parent representation, and gangs in the Clarksville schools. These concerns are briefly described below.

Quality of Life. There is a feeling that the soldiers stationed at Fort Campbell give a lot to their country and that the installation schools are one of the benefits they receive in return. Many Fort Campbell service members were transferred from overseas assignments, and the consistency between the DDESS and DoDDS¹ systems is something that schools in the local area are unable to duplicate.

Parent Representation. Fort Campbell parents currently have input into the education of their children through site-based management committees and the DDESS school board. If the Fort Campbell schools were transferred to a neighboring county, DDESS parents would have to be residents of that county to serve on the local school board. The influence that military parents would have on decisions regarding the education of their children would be diminished significantly.

Gangs in Montgomery County/Clarksville Schools. According to school board members, Montgomery County has recently acknowledged that gangs are active in their school system. Gangs are not an issue in the DDESS system.

Teachers' Union. Although the teachers' union mentioned several issues raised by others on the installation, their comments focused on teaching and meeting the special needs of transient military children. These teachers believe that the DDESS schools offer a high level of support during military unit deployments and provide one of the best support groups available to the children. The DDESS faculty members are accustomed to a high level of turnover in the student body and are skilled in quickly integrating new students into the schools.

Principals. The DDESS principals also focused on the unique needs of military children and the positive attitude on the part of the DDESS staff to make special accommodations. For example, in the local school system, students can fail the entire year if they miss a certain number of days of school. Because mission requirements sometimes require military parents to schedule vacations during the school year, the Fort Campbell DDESS system is more flexible in applying school attendance and

¹ DoDDS stands for Department of Defense Dependents Schools. This is the school system operated by the U.S. Department of Defense for military dependents living on overseas U.S. military installations.

class work requirements. While LEA students are marked absent for the days missed, the DDESS schools provide assignments that the student can complete; students then receive credit for those days.

The principals also noted that the DDESS faculty and staff receive in-service training in grief counseling. The principals stated that this is particularly important due to the mission of the 101st Airborne Division. The principals cited the fatal crash several years ago of a troop transport aircraft in Gander, Newfoundland, as an example. In that incident, several hundred service members stationed at Fort Campbell were killed. School staff reacted quickly with group and individual counseling for all students.

LEA Positions

In the event of a transfer, both LEAs would require the Fort Campbell DDESS facilities. A major issue that would require resolution is whether the Fort Campbell schools would all be operated by one LEA or whether they would be divided between the two LEAs along the existing county/state boundaries. Both superintendents agreed it would be in the best interest of the students and parents to operate the on-post schools as neighborhood schools. This would also help minimize parent concerns about busing. Additional specific issues raised by the two counties are discussed below.

Montgomery County. The superintendent of the Montgomery County schools expressed several concerns regarding a transfer of the Fort Campbell schools to Montgomery County. The primary issue is one of funding. This county is presently experiencing a high level of growth. Although it has the thirteenth highest property taxes in the state (out of 93 counties), the county would be unable to fund the cost of any new schools because of their current construction and renovation commitments. Current federal funding, particularly Impact Aid, is inadequate, and the county would be unable to educate any or all additional on-base students without the guarantee of sufficient long-term funding from the Federal government.

The superintendent also noted a problem with a transfer of the DDESS students and schools along county boundaries. The on-post high school and elementary school located within the Montgomery County boundary would be sufficient to accommodate the on-post high school and elementary students that live within the Montgomery County boundary, but there are no available facilities, either on- or off-post for the corresponding on-post middle school students.

Another major concern was salary comparability between the DDESS system and Montgomery County. The salaries are higher for DDESS staff than for Montgomery County staff. In addition, the retirement benefits accumulated in the Federal system are not comparable or currently transferable to Tennessee programs. In the event of a transfer, these issues would need to be resolved.

Christian County. Christian County has recently experienced a slight decline in enrollment as a result of the growing popularity of several local private schools. This shift was caused, in part, by the recently passed Kentucky Education Reform Act. Under this reform, all primary schools are ungraded, and primary school students receive no letter grades. Schools have the option to keep students in the program an additional year if they feel that the students are not ready to move to middle school. Other reforms include statutory limits on the number of students in each classroom and site-based management for all schools. Because of the recent decline in enrollment, the county's schools are not currently overcrowded, but their excess capacity is not sufficient to accept the 3,000 Fort Campbell students located within the Christian County jurisdictional boundary, much less all students in the DDESS system. The on-post DDESS school buildings would have to be transferred with the students.

The Christian County superintendent further noted that the disparity between the DDESS staff and LEA salaries would need to be resolved prior to any transfer. (Fort Campbell teachers have higher salaries.) He also pointed out that funding is a major issue. Federal government funding equivalent to the local share of the per-pupil expenditure would be required before Christian County could accept the responsibility to educate any additional on-post students.

Summary

Interviews at Fort Campbell and the adjacent LEAs revealed a number of factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the DDESS schools to an LEA. These findings are similar to those in previous studies (GAO, 1986; Bodilly et al., 1988) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Both LEAs are willing to operate the on-post schools as neighborhood schools, minimizing concerns about student busing.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Fort Campbell housing and DDESS facilities are divided into two county LEAs in two separate states. This situation makes jurisdictional issues complex.
- Both of the LEAs eligible to receive the on-post students require access to and ownership of the DDESS facilities. Access to these facilities is currently restricted since Fort Campbell is a closed military installation.
- Both LEAs would condition a transfer on the receipt of more stable funding than is currently provided by the Impact Aid program.

Fort Knox, Kentucky

The Installation

Fort Knox is located approximately 35 miles southwest of Louisville, Kentucky, on the Kentucky-Indiana border. Although the military reservation extends into several counties, the installation housing and administrative complexes are located in Hardin and Meade Counties (both in Kentucky). Most of these facilities are located in Hardin County, the larger of the two counties. Most of the family members at Fort Knox who live off the post live in Hardin County.

Fort Knox is a major training installation. It is home to the U.S. Army Armor Center and School, and the Headquarters for the U.S. Army Recruiting Command. The installation is an open post. The population at Fort Knox includes 8,615 active-duty personnel and 10,000 family members. There are 4,585 family housing units (782 officer and 3,803 enlisted) located on the installation.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

In 1934, the Fort Knox school system was founded because the rural area near Fort Knox had no public school system. The schools were initially supported by tuition and donations. In 1951, the Fort Knox schools became the first to be designated as Section 6 schools.

The current Fort Knox school system consists of nine schools and is one of four DDESS school systems that educates students in all elementary and secondary grades. Table G.13 provides a listing of these schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments. The 3,677 DDESS students represent 62 percent of the 5,930 Fort Knox-affiliated students who live on or off the installation.

Table G.13.
Enrollment at DDESS Schools at Fort Knox

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Ft. Knox High School (9-12)	649
Scott Middle School (7-8)	462
MacDonald Intermediate School (4-6)	412
Walker Intermediate School (4-6)	224
Van Voorhis Elementary School (PK-6)	405
Crittenberger Elementary School (PK-6)	367
Kingsolver Elementary School (PK-3)	346
Pierce Elementary School (PK-3)	372
Mudge Elementary School (PK-3)	440
Total enrollment:	3,677

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Hardin County and Meade County are the two LEAs that would accept responsibility for the Fort Knox students if the DDESS schools were transferred to a local school district. Both LEAs provide a full K-12 program. Table G.14 presents comparative statistics on the two LEAs.

Table G.14.
Enrollment of School Districts Adjacent to Fort Knox

Student Group	Hardin County (20 schools)		Meade County (9 schools)		Total (29 schools)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Military Students						
Living On the Installation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Living Off the Installation	1,981	16	272	7	2,253	14
All Other Students	10,056	84	3,447	93	13,503	86
Total Enrollment:	12,037		3,719		15,756	

Hardin County has 20 schools compared to Meade County's 9. Student enrollment in Hardin County (12,037) is over three times that of Meade County (3,719). Because most of the off-post military personnel live in Hardin County, this school system educates 33 percent of all military-connected students. Approximately 16 percent of the Hardin County school population are military dependents. In contrast, Meade County educates 5 percent of all military school-age children, and 7 percent of its enrollments are military-connected.

Transferring the Fort Knox students to Hardin County would increase its enrollment by almost one-third and raise its military-connected enrollments from 16 percent to 36 percent. In a transfer to Meade County, that county's enrollment would double and its military-connected enrollments would increase from seven percent to 53 percent.

Because the Fort Knox DDESS system educates all children living on the installation, there is little interaction between Fort Knox and the two adjacent LEAs.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEAs

Individual interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, with the superintendents of Hardin and Meade Counties, and with a member of the Fort Knox command group. Discussions were also conducted with the DDESS school board and with groups of DDESS parents, teachers, and school principals.

Installation Positions

None of the representatives of the Fort Knox military installation or the DDESS schools were in favor of transferring the installation schools to an LEA. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent believes that the Fort Knox schools offer a unique, high-quality education to the on-post students which would be compromised if the schools were transferred to an LEA. The superintendent's comments covered the following five issues.

- The Fort Knox DDESS system offers a comprehensive program for all students living on the installation, including all special needs children. This education system offers a wide selection of extracurricular activities and includes health services. These are amenities that the local LEAs are unable to afford.

- Approximately 35 percent of the Fort Knox student body is new each school year. In addition, many students enter and leave the schools throughout the year. The DDESS school system is better prepared than the neighboring counties to work with the unique needs of these transient military children. New students are not stigmatized by their military affiliation. Even for extracurricular activities, new students are accepted based on their ability rather than whether they are next in line.
- The high school in Hardin County is currently overcrowded. If the DDESS schools were transferred to the LEA, there is concern that students from the surrounding area would be bused onto the installation. The schools benefit from their all-military make-up; this benefit would be less if non-military students were enrolled.
- Inequities in salaries, tenure, and retirement benefits for DDESS versus LEA staff would need to be resolved. Staff salaries are higher in the DDESS system than in either of the neighboring school districts.
- The on-post schools are perceived by service members as a benefit that improves their quality of life. There is a feeling that many benefits, particularly those that support soldier and family quality of life, are being scaled back or taken away. Transferring the Fort Knox schools to local control would be a further erosion of such benefits.

Installation Command. The representative of the installation command indicated that the relationship between the installation and the community is excellent. Several concerns were raised, however, about a transfer of the Fort Knox schools to local control. First, it was felt that the on-post schools are providing a high quality education to Fort Knox students; a transfer would not result in any improvement.

Second, the representative pointed out that DDESS schools can exercise better disciplinary control over students because of the links between the schools and the command structure on the post. As a result, problems with violence and discipline are significantly reduced. This linkage would not be possible if the schools were transferred to a local district.

The Fort Knox DDESS school system is a large system with many facilities, including a separate auditorium. These facilities currently support a wide range of Fort Knox community programs (i.e., youth activities, scouts, wives clubs). The commander would be reluctant to relinquish control of these facilities.

Finally, it was noted that Fort Knox parents are actively involved in the education of their children. The same level of involvement would not be easily accomplished in the neighboring school districts.

DDESS School Board. One of the most frequently raised concerns among the Fort Knox school board members was that the on-post schools were able to offer an atmosphere of support and acceptance that was not available in the neighboring counties. Board members indicated that parents had experienced prejudice when they had lived off the installation (both here and when they were stationed elsewhere). Board members stated that parents often felt that their children were treated as outsiders, with less effort being devoted to their education since they move so frequently. This problem is compounded by a belief that the civilian schools are not prepared to deal with transient children or with the problems associated with having parents deployed in dangerous situations. By having the opportunity

to educate their children on the installation, board members feel they are able to shield their children from an “us versus them” attitude, while also providing the extra support required for a military lifestyle.

Teachers’ Union. The primary concerns among members of the teachers’ union were salary, job security, and retirement benefits. Although it was anticipated that most DDESS teachers would be hired by the local schools, the lower salaries in the local schools would represent a substantial pay reduction for DDESS teachers.

Parents of Fort Knox Students. Parents were concerned that transferring the on-post schools would cause military parents to lose their voice in the education of their children. Few military parents would be able to serve on the school board due to residency requirements. They also indicated that Hardin County recently had difficulty passing a school bond referendum due to the influence of the local retirement community. Parents feel that a transfer would give them the worst of both worlds: No influence in the operation of an underfunded LEA with limited community support.

Diminishing Impact Aid funding also concerned these parents. They perceive a declining trend in Impact Aid funding, while the need for education funding continues to grow. Parents perceive the result to be public school districts that have an increasingly difficult time affording the cost of educating children who live on military installations. They see no signs that future Impact Aid funding will be sufficient to educate the current military dependents for whom a DDESS school is not an option, much less to educate the children who are currently in the 15 DDESS school systems.

Principals of Fort Knox DDESS Schools. The principals generally echoed many of the concerns raised by other groups: (a) the local schools are not attuned to the unique needs of military children; (b) children would either be bused from or to schools in the surrounding local schools; (c) Hardin County schools are already overcrowded; (d) a transfer would be a further erosion of the benefits offered to military service members and their families; and (e) the quality of the on-post schools is better than that in the local schools, and a transfer would mean a lower quality of education for the on-post students.

LEA Positions

The physical location of the Fort Knox schools and on-post housing areas presents a jurisdictional problem. The school facilities and family housing units are located in two LEAs: Hardin County and Meade County. Nonetheless, most parties to the transfer discussions agreed that all Fort Knox students should attend the same school system. Most also felt this school system should be the Fort Knox DDESS system and that a transfer of the Fort Knox schools should not be a consideration.

However, when pressed for a position on the transfer issue, Meade County school officials agreed that Hardin County would be the more appropriate LEA to receive the Fort Knox students and the DDESS school system. The Meade County superintendent therefore deferred a discussion of transfer issues to the Hardin County superintendent. The comments of the Hardin County superintendent are summarized below.

Hardin County. Transferring the Fort Knox DDESS students to Hardin County would increase that district’s enrollments by 31 percent. Because the Hardin County schools are currently at capacity, the district would require use of all Fort Knox school buildings. Student busing might also be required to alleviate over-crowding in county schools.

Hardin County schools currently elects a five-member school board. Given that on-post students would represent nearly one-quarter of the district's enrollment, the Hardin County school superintendent feels that some form of Fort Knox parent representation would be desirable. Although most parents living on the installation could not serve in an elected position due to residency requirements, the superintendent believes it might be possible to create an unelected position designated for installation representation.

If the transfer occurred, Hardin County would need assurances that it would be adequately compensated for educating the students living on the installation. The superintendent noted that the county's Impact Aid funding has diminished significantly over the past several years. The Impact Aid revenues generated by the addition of the 3,677 Fort Knox students would not cover the county's cost of educating them. Hardin County would therefore seek funding in addition to Impact Aid and would want a guarantee that such funding would be maintained.

The Hardin County superintendent also pointed out that there are differences between Fort Knox and Hardin Counties regarding faculty salaries, retirement, and tenure. In the event of a transfer, these differences would have to be resolved.

Summary

Interviews at Fort Knox and the Hardin and Meade County LEAs revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the Fort Knox DDESS system to an LEA. These findings support those of previous studies (GAO, 1986; Bodilly et al., 1988) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Hardin County already educates most (88%) of the off-post military students. This experience can be built upon in a transfer.
- Fort Knox is an open post; easy access is available to the DDESS facilities.
- Although the location of installation housing and DDESS facilities divides the Fort Knox student body between the Hardin County and Meade County jurisdictions, LEA and Fort Knox personnel agree that if a transfer occurred, all the Fort Knox students should fall under the jurisdiction of Hardin County.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Hardin County is experiencing growth and overcrowding in its schools near the installation. This could lead to busing of students on-post.
- Fort Knox leaders are reluctant to relinquish control of the large number of DDESS facilities located on the installation.

West Point, New York

The Installation

In 1802, West Point, the United States Military Academy, was established by an act of Congress; it is the nation's oldest military academy. Located 50 miles north of New York City, in the Catskill Mountains along the west side of the Hudson River, West Point has approximately 2,000 officers, enlisted staff, and faculty members whose primary duty is the education and training of more than 4,000 Academy cadets. Family members total 3,419, and all military members assigned to West Point must live at the Academy or on the Stewart Army Subpost, approximately 17 miles to the northwest. West Point is an open installation.

West Point is somewhat geographically isolated. It is bordered on the east by the Hudson River, on the north and west by mountains and forest, and on the south by the town of Highland Falls. As a major employer of the town's residents, West Point is an important economic entity to the area.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The dependents' school on West Point is the oldest school in the DDESS system. Historical records show that a dependent school existed at this post as far back as 1816. The school was officially authorized as part of the Academy in 1821. In 1952, it was incorporated into the Section 6 system.

The one on-post school currently educates 725 children in kindergarten through grade 8. High school students attend school off-post in nearby Highland Falls. The 725 DDESS students are 81 percent of the 890 West Point-affiliated students. Children living at the Stewart Army Subpost attend local schools.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

The Highland Falls school district has an enrollment of 1,060 students in kindergarten through grade 12. Enrollment in the school system has remained stable for the last eight years. Twenty years ago, based on enrollment projections, a new school was constructed but has never been fully utilized. This school building now stands vacant. Table G.15 provides current enrollment statistics on the Highland Falls school district.

Table G.15.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to West Point

Student Group	Highland Falls (3 schools) ¹	
	Number	Percent
Military Living On-Base	165	16
Military Living Off-Base	0	0
All Other Students	895	84
Total Enrollment:	1,060	

¹Count does not include one unused school building.

Highland Falls' school enrollment includes 165 students from West Point. Sixteen percent of Highland Falls' enrollment is military-connected students. If the DDESS students were transferred to Highland Falls, the LEA enrollment would increase to 1,785 students. With such a change, the proportion of West Point-affiliated students in the LEA would increase from 16 percent to 50 percent (i.e., 890 students).

The financial arrangement with the Highland Falls school district is unique within the DDESS system. In most cases, an LEA relies on Impact Aid funds to cover the cost of educating children from a military installation. The Highland Falls LEA receives funds from both the State and Federal governments under a special contractual arrangement. The state provides its share of funding for the West Point-affiliated students as if they were New York state residents. The Federal government provides funds to match the Highland Falls per-pupil expenditures. This contract is reviewed annually.

Overall, the relationship between West Point and the Highland Falls school district is cordial. Installation and Highland Falls representatives serve on a task force to determine what changes could help the local school system be more effective. West Point parents are involved in the day-to-day workings of the Highland Falls High School and the West Point-affiliated students and parents are viewed as contributing to the school district in a positive way.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, the superintendent of the Highland Falls LEA, and a representative of the West Point garrison command group. Discussions were also held with members of the West Point DDESS school board.

Installation Positions

All representatives of the installation and the DDESS schools were opposed to transferring the West Point school to the Highland Falls school district. The following concerns were common to all respondents.

- The West Point DDESS school calendar is synchronized with the Military Academy's school year calendar. This is important because the Academy faculty normally receive their new assignments in June at the end of the Academy's school year. Because the two calendars coincide, dependent children can finish the school year before they have to move. The Highland Falls school district would not be able to make this accommodation.
- The DDESS schools do not require a New York teaching certificate for employment. As a result, the school can hire many on-post parents to teach in the schools. It would be more difficult for these individuals to be hired in the local school district, as New York state certification would be required.
- Concerns were raised about whether the K-8 education provided by the local school district is as good as that available to children living on the installation. Almost three-quarters (73%) of the service members stationed at West Point are commissioned officers who have high expectations for the schools their children attend. The DDESS superintendent described the West Point children as very highly motivated with significant additional resources available to them at home (e.g., home computers). DDESS school officials and the installation leadership felt the on-post school was better able than the larger Highland Falls school district to capitalize on these advantages.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent made two major points for maintaining a separate West Point school system. Each is described below.

Resources. The West Point DDESS school has substantial resources that are not necessarily available in the local community. Current DDESS funding allows the school to maintain a faculty that goes well beyond minimum requirements for instruction. These extras include: full-time positions for three music teachers, four physical education teachers, a counselor, a nurse, and two computer teachers. In addition, several services (e.g., accounting, public works, and computer networking) are provided by the installation, with the school reimbursing the installation for its costs. Not only does this arrangement allow the school to receive these services quickly, it is also very cost effective.

Student Acceptance and Inclusion. There is a concern that the children who live on the installation will be treated as second-class citizens in the local schools. Military-connected students live a very transient lifestyle. There is a fear that school faculty and administrators would not have sufficient experience to accommodate the special problems associated with a student who relocates every two or three years; rather than apply resources to provide assistance, the local district might wait for the student to move on.

Installation Command. In addition to the issues summarized above, the West Point garrison commander stressed that the schools on-post improve the quality of life for service members stationed at West Point. When service members are recruited to teach at the Academy, the availability of an on-post school helps to round out the total package of benefits offered. There is a concern that if the school were transferred to local control, it would be more difficult to recruit high-quality faculty for the academy.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board was concerned about input from military parents. If the school were transferred to the local school district, the parents living on the installation would not have a voice in the education of their children. Military parents would not be able to serve on the Highland Falls school board, since the installation is not considered part of the Highland Falls district

The school board also pointed out that West Point is in a very isolated location with no available education alternatives (e.g., private schools). Board members felt a transfer of the DDESS schools would result in a compromise of the current high-quality education received by the on-post children. Parents would have no option other than the Highland Falls schools.

LEA Positions

Highland Falls school district officials are currently satisfied with the compensation they receive from the federal government to educate the West Point high school students. Under the current arrangement, there is no financial hardship or disadvantage to the Highland Falls district for educating the West Point students.

The success of this current arrangement for the West Point high school students prompted district officials to suggest during the interview that on-post students in grades 7 and 8 attend the Highland Falls schools as well. This suggestion is based on the assumption that a similar funding arrangement would be made for these additional students. The school district could then make use of its surplus school building.

Highland Falls school district officials listed the following issues that would have to be resolved before they could accept responsibility for the DDESS school and all the West Point-affiliated students:

- The West Point DDESS facilities are outside the jurisdictional boundaries of Highland Falls, and state law prohibits school districts from crossing jurisdictional lines to educate students. Although there was considerable discussion of possible solutions and alternatives, it was generally agreed that the limited number of Highland Falls school buildings was not sufficient to accommodate all of the additional West Point students. The LEA would need to use the West Point DDESS facilities; this issue could be a major impediment to a transfer.
- District officials consider Federal Impact Aid too unreliable to be a viable funding option. Adequate compensation, similar to the current arrangement for the high school students, would be required.

Summary

Interviews at West Point and the Highland Falls LEA revealed a number of factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the West Point DDESS system to an LEA. These findings are similar to those of previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- The Highland Falls school district is the only LEA for transfer consideration. Thus, there is no jurisdictional conflict.
- Highland Falls already educates the West Point high school students. This experience can be built upon in a transfer agreement.
- West Point is an open facility. Security concerns are minimal.
- Most school assignments would probably not be affected by a transfer. That is, it is unlikely that elementary students (grades K-6) would be bused off the installation.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- The West Point DDESS facilities are located outside the jurisdictional boundary of Highland Falls. The LEA would need special jurisdictional authority over property located within the installation.
- The local district does not consider Impact Aid funding a viable funding source. The LEA would insist on additional funding only through a contract arrangement.
- Grade 7-8 students would most likely be bused to a school off the installation.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina

The Installation

Fort Bragg is located 40 miles south of Raleigh, North Carolina. Although this large installation, and the adjoining Pope Air Force Base, extend into several counties, the main installation facilities are located in Cumberland County and oriented toward the town of Fayetteville. Fort Bragg has several major highways running through it, making it an unusually open installation.

Fort Bragg is the home of the 82nd Airborne Division, the XVIII Airborne Corps, and the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center. Due to the nature of its mission, the 82nd Airborne Division must remain at a high level of readiness to meet short-notice unit deployment requirements.

The population at Fort Bragg includes 39,000 active-duty personnel and 75,000 family members. Although there are approximately 5,000 family housing units (960 officer and 4,104 enlisted) located on the installation, only about 20 percent of the military family members live on the installation.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

In 1921, the first schools were opened on Fort Bragg for students in kindergarten through grade 8. The installation schools initially operated with state funds, although they were located on federal property in federal buildings. The installation commander and school board made all decisions concerning the schools, but the schools remained under the jurisdiction of the Cumberland County school board. In 1951, the schools became Section 6 schools. Later, when family quarters were built on the adjoining Pope Air Force Base (AFB)², all children from that installation were integrated into the Fort Bragg school system. Students in grade 9 have alternately attended school on and off the installation. In 1976, all Fort Bragg students in grade 9 attended school in Fayetteville because of overcrowding in the Fort Bragg/Pope schools; but by 1995, with more available facilities, almost all of the students in grade 9 living on the Fort Bragg/Pope installation attended Fort Bragg schools.

The Fort Bragg DDESS system currently consists of eight schools (including one school, Pope Elementary School, located on Pope Air Force Base) and enrolls about 4,700 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 9. High school students are bused to nearby Cumberland County schools. Table G.16 provides a listing of the Fort Bragg schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments. The Fort Bragg schools comprise the largest of the 15 DDESS systems included in this transfer study. Nonetheless, this DDESS system educates only 26 percent of the military students affiliated with Fort Bragg and Pope AFB.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

As the only adjacent school district, the Cumberland County LEA would be the single LEA accepting responsibility for the education of the Fort Bragg/Pope AFB students if a transfer were enacted. Table G.17 provides current enrollment statistics on the Cumberland County school system.

² The Fort Bragg DDESS system provides service to both Fort Bragg and the adjoining Pope AFB. The population at Pope AFB includes 4,800 active-duty members. The base has 89 officer and 370 enlisted family housing units.

Table G.16.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Fort Bragg

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Bowley Elementary School (PK-4)	786
Butner Elementary School (PK-4)	620
Holbrook Elementary School (PK-4)	466
McNair Elementary School (PK-4)	412
Murray Elementary School (PK-4)	487
Pope Elementary School (PK-4)	348
Irwin Middle School (5-6)	812
Albritton Junior High School (7-9)	788
Total enrollment:	4,719

Table G.17.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Fort Bragg

Student Group	Cumberland County (72 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Students		
Living On the Installation	457	1
Living Off the Installation	12,704	28
All Other Students	31,511	71
Total Enrollment:	44,672	

Cumberland County educates about three-quarters (74%) of the total military school-age population associated with Fort Bragg and Pope AFB. Approximately 29 percent of the students in the Cumberland County schools are military dependents. If responsibility for educating all Fort Bragg/Pope-affiliated students were transferred to the county, the military-connected students would number 17,880 and would constitute 36 percent of the LEA enrollment.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Individual interviews were conducted with the Fort Bragg and Cumberland County school superintendents, and with the installation commanders from Fort Bragg and Pope AFB. Discussions were also held with DDESS school board members and with representatives of the DDESS teachers' union.

Installation Positions

None of the representatives from Fort Bragg, Pope AFB or the DDESS schools favored transferring the Fort Bragg DDESS schools to the Cumberland County LEA. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The superintendent indicated that the DDESS school system is well staffed and has sufficient resources to accomplish its mission. In particular, the superintendent

believes that the DDESS schools provide a high quality education to the school-age family members living on the installations. The military personnel stationed at Fort Bragg are highly transient and subject to short-notice deployment. This aspect of military life puts stress and uncertainty into the lives of the school children. The DDESS schools work to counter this stress by helping students adjust to the new school when they enroll (e.g., by providing counseling when necessary).

According to the superintendent, the faculty and staff of the Fort Bragg DDESS schools encourage a high level of parent involvement. Parents provide supplemental no-cost services to the DDESS system and ultimately to the students. This involvement gives parents a strong sense of ownership in the schools.

The superintendent felt that in contrast to the Fort Bragg schools, the Cumberland County schools are overcrowded. He feels the county does a good job with available resources, but the LEA is unable to provide the same high level of service as the Fort Bragg schools.

Installation Command. The concerns raised by both installation commanders centered around four issues. First, he felt that the quality of education for the students living on the installation is currently very high. If the schools were transferred to the LEA, there is a concern that quality might be compromised.

Second, the installation commanders believe the schools are critical to the quality of life of military personnel and their family members. The children are provided a high quality education in an atmosphere of support and sensitivity not available in the surrounding LEA. The DDESS schools welcome children who enroll long after the school year has begun. Services are readily available to provide counseling to children of families affected by short-notice military deployments. In the commanders' view, the security of knowing that their children are well taken care of has a direct impact on the readiness of the troops stationed at both Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base.

Third, the Fort Bragg commander pointed out that the neighboring school system is currently overcrowded and underfunded. Thus, Cumberland County is not in a good position to assume the additional responsibility of educating the students currently residing on Fort Bragg or Pope AFB.

Finally, while Fort Bragg is an open installation, access to Pope AFB is very tightly controlled. Cumberland County schools would need free access to the Pope Elementary School in order to serve on-base children at Pope Air Force Base. The Pope AFB commander was unwilling to provide this level of access.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board felt that transferring the DDESS schools to the control of Cumberland County was not in the best interest of the children, their parents, or Cumberland County. The DDESS school board based its conclusion on five concerns: quality of life, the unique needs of military children, parent representation, the burden on the LEA, and busing. These concerns are discussed below.

Quality of life. The DDESS schools contribute to the total package of benefits available to service members. Board members noted that if these schools were transferred, it would signal a further erosion of the quality of life for military members.

The unique needs of military children. The children of military members move frequently, and their parents are often deployed on short notice. The on-post schools offer a significant level of

counseling and support for these children, as well as the opportunity to attend school with children who are all in a similar position.

Parent representation. If the DDESS schools were transferred to Cumberland County, the parents living on Fort Bragg and Pope AFB would no longer have the influence they currently have in the education of their children. These parents could not serve in a voting capacity on the Cumberland County school board due to residency requirements. They also do not feel that they would be as welcome in the schools as volunteers.

Burden on the LEA. Cumberland County schools are currently overcrowded. Due to diminished Impact Aid funding, the county is only minimally compensated for the education of high school students who live on the installations. The addition of the remaining installation students, it is believed, would put more stress on an already over-burdened school system.

Busing. The DDESS school board is concerned that Fort Bragg students would be bused to schools off the installation in order to achieve racial balance in the LEA. It is important to the board that the students remain in on-post schools.

Teachers' Union. The teachers' union focused on compensation and retirement. The DDESS teachers receive higher salaries than do LEA teachers. Other personnel policies (e.g., hiring, tenure, and benefits) would also need to be resolved before a transfer could be considered.

The teachers' union also reinforced several concerns raised by other Fort Bragg groups. More specifically, the union representatives emphasized that DDESS teachers provide considerable support for children whose parents are deployed on short-notice military missions. The union believed that such support would not be likely if on-base students were attending the local public schools.

LEA Positions

The Cumberland County school district is growing by approximately 900 students per year. The LEA has a high population density coupled with a low per capita income. As a result, the local revenue share for the LEA is \$240 per student below the state average. A bond issue in 1992 included large additions to all high school buildings. Despite this recent construction, the schools remain overcrowded, and a large construction backlog continues.

The Cumberland County school superintendent felt there was a significant level of military involvement in the operations of the county schools. For example, the Fort Bragg installation commander appoints a service member to serve as a non-voting member of the school board. Also, there are informal sponsorship links between military organizations and individual LEA schools. Third, PTA officers are frequently military parents.

The Cumberland County school system would be willing to accept a transfer of the DDESS schools if the installation communities were amenable to such an action and if three main issues—overcrowding, funding, and staffing considerations—could be satisfactorily resolved.

Overcrowding. Due to their current high level of overcrowding, Cumberland County would require the existing DDESS facilities. The intent would be to continue to serve on-post children in their neighborhood schools. There could be no guarantee that children living in the local community would not be transported to the on-post schools.

Funding. Additional funding, in addition to the Impact Aid funding that would be received for the transferring DDESS students, would be required to cover the costs of operating the DDESS schools (i.e., to cover start-up costs, school operation, and capital outlay). The LEA superintendent believes that without this additional funding, the cost of educating the DDESS students would place an undue financial burden on the taxpaying residents of Cumberland County.

Staffing Considerations. The DDESS faculty and staff enjoy compensation, tenure, hiring, assignment, and retirement programs that are not comparable with those of LEA employees. These programs and benefits do not appear to be compatible with programs offered by the state of North Carolina. Program differences would require resolution before a transfer could be considered.

Summary

Interviews at Fort Bragg and the Cumberland County LEA revealed a number of factors that could either facilitate or impede a transfer of the DDESS schools to Cumberland County. These findings are similar to those presented in previous studies of the DDESS schools (GAO, 1986; Bodilly et al., 1988). A summary of these factors is presented below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflicts would arise.
- Fort Bragg is an open installation. Transfer of the school facilities on this installation would involve few security concerns.
- Cumberland County already educates all the Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base high school students and nearly three-quarters of all school-age military dependents. This experience could be built upon in a transfer.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Cumberland County would require funds in addition to Impact Aid to cover the initial costs of transfer, as well as to cover the long-term costs of educating the DDESS students and capital outlays.
- Because the LEA is overcrowded, it needs the DDESS facilities. One of the DDESS schools is located on Pope Air Force Base, where access is limited. Pope AFB is unwilling to grant the LEA access to this facility.

Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

The Installation

Camp Lejeune was established in the late 1930s and became a major training installation for the Marine Corps during World War II. Today it is the largest amphibious warfare training installation in the world. Camp Lejeune is currently the home station of the II Marine Expeditionary Force, the 2nd Marine Division, and other important elements of the Marine Corps Forces, Atlantic. The installation includes 41,110 active-duty personnel and 57,000 family members. There are over 4,400 family housing units (657 officer and 3,796 enlisted) located on the installation. Housing is considered limited and only about one-fourth of the military families stationed at Camp Lejeune live on the installation. Camp Lejeune is a closed installation.

Camp Lejeune is located 40 miles north of Wilmington, North Carolina, on the Onslow County coastline. The installation occupies nearly one-fourth of the county's land area. Camp Lejeune is considered one of Onslow County's major employers.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The Camp Lejeune schools date back to the establishment of the installation. These schools have never been part of the Onslow County school system.

Camp Lejeune is one of only four DDESS systems that offer a full K-12 program. Its eight DDESS schools educate 3,505 of the 3,519 students who live on the base. Table G.18 provides a listing of these schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments.

Table G.18.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Camp Lejeune

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Lejeune High School (9-12)	507
Brewster Middle School (6-8)	741
Delalio Elementary School (K-5)	292
Russell Elementary School (K-5)	421
Stone Street Elementary School (K-5)	392
Tarawa Terrace I Elementary School (K-3)	345
Tarawa Terrace II Elementary School (K-5)	393
Berkeley Manor Elementary School (K-5)	414
Total enrollment:	3,505

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

As the only adjacent school district, Onslow County would be the single LEA to be considered if DDESS students were transferred to an LEA. Table G.19 provides current enrollment statistics on the Onslow County school district.

Table G.19.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Camp Lejeune

Student Group	Onslow County (28 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Students		
Living On the Installation	14 ¹	<1
Living Off the Installation	5,976	34
All Other Students	11,357	65
Total Enrollment:	17,347	

¹Students in military families in transition from housing in the LEA to on-base housing.
Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Onslow County educates nearly two-thirds (63%) of all military-connected students in the area. Approximately 35 percent of the students in the Onslow County schools are military dependents. Transferring the Camp Lejeune students to Onslow County would increase the Onslow County enrollment by about 20 percent and increase its proportion of military-connected students from 35 percent to 45 percent.

Onslow County schools are currently experiencing rapid growth. Enrollment increases (approximately 400 students per year) are expected to continue for several years. This population growth has not been accompanied by growth in property tax revenues, as a large portion of the new county residents are moving into mobile homes. In an attempt to keep school facilities in line with growth, county voters have passed two bond issues since 1988. The first bond issue supported the construction of four new schools. Plans for funds generated by the second bond issue include renovating a school building and constructing three new school buildings. Onslow County school officials believe the LEA needs \$50 million above that raised by the two recent bond issues.

Since the Camp Lejeune schools educate almost all children living on the installation, interaction between these schools and the Onslow County school district is limited and informal. The two districts compete athletically at the high school level and share information on staff searches.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Individual interviews were conducted with the superintendent of the Camp Lejeune DDESS system, the Camp Lejeune installation commander, and the superintendent of the Onslow County schools. Group meetings were held with DDESS school principals, the DDESS school board, and representatives of the DDESS teachers' union.

Installation Positions

Overall, representatives of the installation and the DDESS schools felt that the schools at Camp Lejeune provide a good education. They did not support a transfer of the Camp Lejeune schools to the Onslow County school system.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent highlighted four issues that were relevant to a transfer of the Camp Lejeune schools.

- The on-base schools improve the quality of life for the service members stationed at Camp Lejeune. Parents are able to enroll their children in neighborhood schools with a good environment, numerous parent volunteers, and many teacher aides. Parents have come to see the schools as one of the benefits of living on the installation. Transferring control of the schools to the LEA would be perceived as an erosion of the quality of life for military families.
- While the schools in the surrounding county are able to offer a wider range of extracurricular activities, the DDESS superintendent felt that the academic offerings at the Camp Lejeune schools were comparable to those in the LEA. For example, the Camp Lejeune schools offer advanced placement courses in at least as many subject areas as the Onslow County LEA.
- The superintendent noted that there are approximately 300 exceptional family members living on the installation. Services provided by the DDESS schools to these family members are more comprehensive than those available in Onslow County. The DDESS staff is very experienced and procedures are well-established to evaluate and place special needs students quickly.
- The DDESS superintendent also discussed the significant personnel issues that would need to be resolved if a transfer were to take place. These included (a) the presence of a union at Camp Lejeune (while North Carolina does not allow collective bargaining for state employees, including public school personnel); (b) the higher salaries of faculty and staff at Camp Lejeune in comparison to Onslow County; and (c) the inability of Camp Lejeune employees to buy into the North Carolina state retirement program.

Installation Commander. The installation commander indicated that the schools fill a unique need on the installation and that it is important they continue in this role in the future. The commander pointed out that Camp Lejeune schools are truly neighborhood schools and enjoy strong support from the family members assigned to the installation. He viewed the schools as a good influence on the students enrolled in them which in turn has a positive impact on morale among service members. Most of the service members stationed at Camp Lejeune are subject to short-notice, high-risk deployments. In the commander's view, knowing that family members are being served in a strong support environment provides reassurance and allows deploying service members to focus on the military mission with minimum distraction.

The commander noted that some of the schools on the installation will need repair or renovation in the near future. He believes that the Onslow County schools are not in a financial position to assume responsibility for and upkeep of the aging DDESS school buildings.

Finally, the commander believes that service members elect to live on the installation for two main reasons: security and schools. If the schools were transferred, it might be difficult to continue to fill all the installation housing units.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board indicated that the Camp Lejeune schools are very well-regarded in the military community. In contrast, many parents feel that the Onslow County schools would not serve their children well. School board members pointed out that many service members choose to be geographic bachelors while waiting for on-base housing so that their children can

enroll in the DDESS schools rather than the local public schools. The high quality of the on-base schools was cited as a major contributor to the long wait for housing. The DDESS school board also noted the excellent services available to their special-needs students and the overcrowding in the Onslow County schools.

Teachers' Union. Representatives of the DDESS instructional and support staff unions noted that Onslow County has one of the lowest local per-pupil expenditures in North Carolina. Recent growth in the county has come in the form of low paying industries such as fast food and other service industries. As a result, it was their opinion that the local school district is not in a position to take on the additional 3,500 students currently being educated at Camp Lejeune.

Principals. The Camp Lejeune school principals put forth several reasons against transfer of the DDESS schools: (a) the LEA is very overcrowded and could not absorb an additional 3,500 students, (b) the special education services provided to students at Camp Lejeune exceed those available in Onslow County, and (c) the collective bargaining that is currently in place for unionized personnel at Camp Lejeune would not be available in Onslow County.

In addition to these issues, the DDESS principals felt that funding for education programs in Onslow County was inadequate and that if a transfer were to take place, equipment and supplies from the well-furnished DDESS schools would be redistributed among the lesser-equipped county schools.

LEA Positions

Onslow County school officials were reluctant to take a position regarding transfer. However, they did express a willingness to provide whatever support would be necessary if a decision were made to transfer the DDESS schools. In discussing the conditions that would facilitate transfer of the Camp Lejeune schools, several issues were raised.

Onslow County would require access to and responsibility for the on-base facilities. The LEA would perform all routine maintenance of the buildings and would need assurances that they could make capital construction improvements as necessary. Federal funds would need to be provided for this maintenance and improvement. In addition, the LEA might bus students onto the installation to relieve overcrowding in other schools. Third, the installation would have to be open to education personnel, or special arrangements would have to be made to allow access to the Camp Lejeune facilities.

Personnel issues (including salary, benefits, retirement, and collective bargaining) were discussed. Differences between the salaries and benefits of the school personnel employed by Camp Lejeune and Onslow County would have to be resolved. In the event of a transfer, Camp Lejeune DDESS personnel hired by Onslow County may be subject to major financial penalties by having to switch to the North Carolina retirement system. Camp Lejeune personnel who are members of a teachers' union would have to resign from those unions if hired by Onslow County, since North Carolina is a nonunion state.

Citing the steady decrease in Federal Impact Aid payments the county has received, officials stated they would need assurances that they would be adequately compensated for the future costs of educating the on-base students. In addition, because Impact Aid is not forward-funded, the LEA would require sufficient up-front transition funding before accepting the DDESS students.

Onslow County officials also noted that Camp Lejeune currently provides all services for children with special needs living on the installation. If responsibility for the Camp Lejeune students

were transferred to Onslow County, LEA officials anticipated that some of these services (particularly those for low incidence disabilities) might have to be consolidated.

Finally, the Onslow County school board has recently moved from partisan to non-partisan elections. Although this may afford the parents living on the installation increased opportunity to serve on the local school board, residency requirements would still have to be met.

Summary

Interviews at Camp Lejeune and in the adjacent Onslow County LEA revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the DDESS schools to the LEA. These factors are similar to those found by previous studies (GAO, 1986; Bodilly et al., 1988) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflicts would arise.
- Onslow County already educates a large number (5,990) of military-connected students associated with Camp Lejeune and could build on this experience.
- Onslow County would not bus students off the installation; students living on the installation could continue to attend neighborhood schools.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Camp Lejeune is a closed installation with very limited access. The eight DDESS school buildings are located throughout the installation. Providing access to the schools might be difficult.
- Onslow County would require funding in addition to that provided by Impact Aid. These funds would be needed to cover the local share of costs arising from a rapid increase in enrollment, and the continuing costs of educating the current DDESS students.
- In the event the LEA assumed ownership or long-term leasing of the DDESS buildings, funding arrangements (in addition to Impact Aid) would be required to cover the costs of maintaining and providing capital improvements to the buildings.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina

The Installation

Fort Jackson is located near Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. Both Fort Jackson and Columbia are part of Richland County, one of the most populous counties in the state. First established in 1917 as an infantry training center, Fort Jackson now provides basic and advanced individual training. Nearly 40,000 service members are trained at Fort Jackson each year. Fort Jackson is an open installation.

The number of personnel stationed at Fort Jackson has grown considerably in recent years. Most of this growth has been due to the realignment or closing of other installations. Fort Jackson currently has assigned to it 8,525 active-duty personnel who are accompanied by 3,178 family members. There are over 1,250 family housing units (100 officer and 1,166 enlisted) located on the installation. Since excess housing needs are met by the surrounding community, there are no plans to build additional on-post housing to accommodate Fort Jackson's anticipated growth.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

The Fort Jackson schools were established in 1963 because of segregation in the local schools. The schools currently serve 1,034 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 6. The 1,034 DDESS students represent 37 percent of the 2,766 Fort Jackson-affiliated students living on the installation or in the two closest LEAs. Table G.20 provides a listing of the Fort Jackson schools, with their grade ranges and enrollments. On-post students in grades 7-12 attend school in the nearby Richland County School District Two.

Table G.20.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Fort Jackson

School	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Pierce Terrace Elementary School (PK-1)	352
Hood Street Elementary School (PK, 2-3)	292
Pinckney Elementary School (PK, 4-6)	390
Total enrollment:	1,034

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Richland County is divided into two LEAs—Richland One and Richland Two. Richland One, which encompasses the city of Columbia, is the larger of the two LEAs; it has over 25,000 students. Approximately 420 Fort Jackson students live and attend school in Richland One. Richland Two serves the rest of Richland County and enrolls about 12,500 students, including over 1,000 Fort Jackson students. A small number of students affiliated with Fort Jackson attend school in the two LEAs in nearby Lexington County. However, since the jurisdictional boundary of Richland Two includes the Fort Jackson DDESS schools and installation housing areas, it is the only LEA to be considered to accept responsibility for the education of the Fort Jackson students. Table G.21 provides current enrollment statistics on Richland Two.

Table G.21.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Fort Jackson

Student Group	Richland 2 (13 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Students		
Living On the Installation	363	3
Living Off the Installation	949	8
All Other Students	11,179	89
Total Enrollment:	12,491	

Richland Two educates about 41 percent of the total military school-age population. (The military dependents in Richland One are included in this calculation, but those in Lexington County are not). Approximately 11 percent of the students in Richland Two are military dependents. The Richland Two LEA is about 12 times the size of the Fort Jackson DDESS system and educates slightly more military-connected students than does the DDESS system. If the DDESS students were transferred to Richland Two, the LEA's military-connected enrollment would increase from 11 percent to 17 percent.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Separate interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, the Fort Jackson garrison commander, and Richland Two district officials. Discussions also were held with the DDESS school board, parents of DDESS students, members of parent-teacher organizations, members of the DDESS parent advisory council, and DDESS administrators.

Installation Positions

None of the Fort Jackson installation or DDESS personnel interviewed for this report were in favor of transferring the Fort Jackson schools to Richland Two. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent focused on the high-quality education provided to students living on the installation. The following factors were noted as support for the importance of the education provided by the DDESS schools.

- The Fort Jackson school faculty and administrators are more experienced and better able to cater to the unique needs of the transient military student population than are teachers and administrators in Richland Two. DDESS students at all levels are assessed and placed very quickly, with minimal interruption to their education.
- The installation schools are able to offer a level of flexibility that is not possible in Richland Two. Military students frequently move during the school year and legitimately miss school days in the process. South Carolina schools have very strict attendance regulations regarding the number of school days a student may miss and still be advanced to the next grade level. While the local public schools are bound by their attendance regulations, the installation schools exercise considerable flexibility regarding attendance and individually assess students' skills to decide whether a student should be advanced to the next grade.

- Because of the military mission of the installation, many of the DDESS students have parents who are drill sergeants. The nature of the drill sergeant's job requires him or her to work an average of 80-90 hours per week. The assurance that their children are being cared for in surroundings sensitive to their work environment allows military members to focus on their mission without distraction. This benefit is particularly important for the growing number of drill sergeants who are single parents.
- Parental involvement is very strong in the Fort Jackson schools. Parents have formal involvement through elected positions on the school board and parent advisory committees. Most parents could not hold elected offices in Richland Two due to residency requirements. There is also a high level of parent volunteerism in the on-post schools, and a concern that parents would not be welcomed as volunteers in the Richland Two schools.

Installation Command. The Fort Jackson garrison commander was reluctant to support any situation that would alter the current education system for installation dependents. He emphasized important aspects of the DDESS schools that would not be found in the local community: (a) Fort Jackson schools are oriented toward educating the transient military child; (b) Fort Jackson schools cater to the unique needs of the children of drill sergeants; and (c) Fort Jackson parents enjoy a high level of involvement and influence in the education of their children.

Three additional issues were raised—neighborhood schools, extended day programs, and control of the DDESS buildings.

Neighborhood Schools. The DDESS students currently attend neighborhood schools; all students can either walk or ride a bike to school. If the schools were transferred, on-post personnel are concerned that their children might be bused off the installation or that students from the surrounding county might be bused onto the installation. This busing would dilute the “neighborhood” nature of the school system.

Extended Day Programs. The schools on the installation have a direct link with the Fort Jackson child development center. The child development center opens at 5:30 a.m. and closes at 6:00 p.m. Students can ride a bus from the center to school and back to the center when school is over. This program enables parents to meet longer workday requirements with the assurance that their children are in a well supervised environment. Such total community support may be difficult to maintain if the DDESS schools are transferred to Richland Two.

Control of the Buildings. Several building-control issues (e.g., legal ownership/title and responsibilities for extended maintenance) would have to be resolved before a transfer could be enacted. Responsibilities for fire and rescue, security, and other support services normally provided by the local government would also have to be determined.

DDESS School Board, Parent-Teacher Organization Members, and Parent Advisory Council Members. In separate discussions, each of these parent groups echoed concerns that were raised by other installation representatives. Specifically, they indicated that the DDESS schools provide a unique educational environment that efficiently integrates new students. This effort includes quickly evaluating special needs students, allowing students to join extra-curricular activities in mid-year, and addressing the special needs of transient military children.

Issues regarding the quality of education in South Carolina and the ability of Richland Two to provide an adequate education for the students living on Fort Jackson were also discussed. These issues are outlined below.

- The Fort Jackson schools provide a high quality education that is consistent with the instruction provided in other DoD schools. This continuity is particularly important to military children transferring to and from locations that support DDESS programs. If these schools were transferred, this important continuity would be lost.
- The Fort Jackson schools are perceived to be a major quality-of-life benefit provided to service members and their families. Transfer of the Fort Jackson schools would be a further erosion of the military's already dwindling benefits. The withdrawal of benefits, particularly when they pertain to the military family, could prompt a change in military career intentions.
- Parents noted that the Fort Jackson schools do not appear to have as many discipline problems as the LEA. School officials and parents attribute this situation to the homogeneous, all-military nature of the on-post schools. In addition, the support of the Fort Jackson leaders provides DDESS school administrators with a wide range of options to resolve student discipline problems. Such options range from parent, student, and teacher discussions to the availability of on-post social services and medical support. In parents' view, the on-post school system is able to provide an environment where students can focus on education without distraction.

DDESS School Administrators. School administrators noted that because the DDESS schools are fairly well-funded, they can focus on the task of educating students rather than the problems associated with funding education programs. In contrast, DDESS administrators believe that LEA administrators must spend a considerable amount of time developing, justifying, and adjusting the budgets associated with the operation of their school system. As a result, DDESS administrators believe that their schools are able to provide a better education to the Fort Jackson students than could the Richland Two school district.

LEA Positions

Richland Two is experiencing considerable growth—approximately 600 students per year. To accommodate this growth, recent construction has included one high school, one middle school and two elementary schools. Despite this construction, Richland Two currently uses 142 portable classrooms. The LEA has plans to open two additional elementary schools and another middle school by the year 2001. Richland Two also is examining other alternatives to alleviate overcrowding (e.g., moving to a year-round school year), since planned construction is expected to fall short of projected growth.

In discussing the transfer of the Fort Jackson schools, Richland Two officials raised the following specific issues:

- The Fort Jackson school buildings would be required. Elementary students living on the installation would continue to attend school on the installation. This accommodation would be made because Richland Two does not have sufficient classroom space available to absorb the students living on the installation. There is also a strong desire on the part of Richland Two officials to retain the Fort Jackson elementary schools as neighborhood schools. However, if the facilities on the installation were underutilized, Richland Two officials might assign students (military or otherwise) who did not live on Fort Jackson to those schools.

- LEA officials noted that educating the Fort Jackson elementary school students would place a substantial financial burden on the Richland Two district. Additional funding (beyond that provided by Impact Aid) would be needed. Even if Impact Aid were funded at full entitlement, additional “transition” funds would be needed to offset the increase in costs brought about by the rapid rise in the total number of LEA students. Richland Two also would seek a commitment from the Federal government that suitable long-term funding would be provided to defray the costs of maintaining the school buildings and to provide a funding source for capital improvements and renovations.
- Issues concerning teacher compensation, tenure, and retirement would require satisfactory resolution.

Richland Two officials stated that they would not actively seek control of the Fort Jackson DDESS schools. However, they did feel that if the transfer were to take place, the impediments to transfer could be satisfactorily resolved by the Federal and state governments working with Richland Two and the installation.

Summary

Interviews at Fort Jackson and the adjacent Richland Two LEA revealed factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the Fort Jackson DDESS schools to an LEA. These factors are similar to those found by previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflict would arise.
- Fort Jackson is an open installation, and Richland Two already has access to transport the grade 7-12 students who live on the installation. Access issues should be minimal.
- Richland LEA officials would attempt to maintain the Fort Jackson installation schools as neighborhood schools for the children living on the installation.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Richland Two is extremely overcrowded. It would need the DDESS schools in order to have sufficient space to accommodate the additional on-post students. Richland Two may need to assign students who do not live on the installation to the Fort Jackson schools.
- Richland Two would require Federal funds beyond Impact Aid to cover the long-term costs of educating the additional on-post students. In addition, because Impact Aid is not forward funded, the LEA would require sufficient up-front “transition” funding before accepting these students.
- In the event the LEA required ownership or long term leasing of the DDESS buildings, funding arrangements (in addition to Federal Impact Aid) would be required to cover costs of maintaining and providing capital improvements to the buildings.

Laurel Bay Marine Corps Base, South Carolina

The Installation

Laurel Bay Marine Corps Base (MCB) is the military housing area operated by the Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station near Beaufort, South Carolina. It is a restricted-access military housing facility with approximately 1,100 family housing units. This facility provides on-base housing for military personnel assigned to any of three Beaufort area military installations: Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort Naval Hospital, and Parris Island Marine Corps Recruit Depot. Although on-base housing is available at each of these installations, the Laurel Bay housing area contains the majority of on-base housing available in the area.

Laurel Bay is located in Beaufort County, about 70 miles south of Charleston, South Carolina, and 45 miles north of Savannah, Georgia. The nearest towns to the housing area are Beaufort (population 25,000) and Port Royal (population 3,000). The local military installations contribute significantly to the area's economy, but the major industry in the area is tourism.

The total military population for all four installations includes 5,576 active-duty personnel and 9,164 family members. A little more than one-half (approximately 53%) of the military family members live in the local community.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

Located on the Laurel Bay Marine Corps Base, the Laurel Bay DDESS system opened in 1958 when the base housing area was created for personnel assigned to the Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station. Although built with federal funds, the on-base schools were originally operated by the Beaufort County school district. In 1961, the schools were converted to a Section 6 school system because of segregation in the local school district. The on-base schools originally served only students from the Marine Corps Air Station. In 1973, students from the Parris Island Recruit Depot and the Naval Hospital also began attending the Laurel Bay schools.

The DDESS system currently consists of two schools that educate students in pre-kindergarten through grade 6. On-base 6th-graders have the choice of attending school in Beaufort County or Laurel Bay; most attend the on-base school. The on-base students in grades 7-12 attend the Beaufort County schools with transportation provided by the county. About 80 percent of the Laurel Bay DDESS students live on Laurel Bay MCB and walk to class. The remainder are transported from the other three military installations. Table G.22 provides statistics on the Laurel Bay schools, with grade levels and enrollments. Fifty-two percent of all local-area military students attend the Laurel Bay DDESS schools.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

As the only adjacent school district, Beaufort County would be the LEA accepting responsibility for the education of the Laurel Bay students. The county school system serves students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Table G.23 provides current enrollment statistics on the Beaufort County school district.

Table G.22.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Laurel Bay MCB

DDESS Schools and Grade Ranges	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Laurel Bay Primary School (PK-2)	705
Laurel Bay Intermediate School (3-6)	580
Total enrollment:	1,285

Table G.23.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Laurel Bay MCB

Student Group	Beaufort County (19 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Living On-Base	258	2
Military Living Off-Base	922	7
All Other Students	11,534	91
Total Enrollment:	12,714	

The Beaufort County school district educates about one-half (48%) of all military-connected students. However, because of the large size of the Beaufort district, military students account for only about 9 percent of the total district population. Accepting the Laurel Bay students would increase the overall student population of Beaufort County by 10 percent and increase the proportion of military-connected students from 9 percent to 18 percent.

Beaufort County already educates all the military students in grades 7-12, so there is considerable interaction between the LEA and the DDESS. Transition programs for 6th- and 7th-grade students are in place. Also, each of the four local military installations has a representative that acts as a liaison with the county school district.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Individual interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, the superintendent of the Beaufort County schools, and the installation commander from Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station. Discussions were also held with members of the Laurel Bay DDESS school board.

Installation Positions

No installation or DDESS school representative was in favor of transferring the Laurel Bay schools to the Beaufort County school district. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent felt that the DDESS and LEA systems have a very positive working relationship, with a specific focus on the smooth transition of Laurel Bay 6th-graders to the Beaufort County middle school. The superintendent also noted that there are differences between the two systems, particularly in performance on standardized tests; Beaufort County students' test scores are lower than those of the Laurel Bay students. The DDESS superintendent

reported that despite the implementation of considerable reforms by the local school district, Beaufort County scores have shown little improvement. He felt the current level of education the students receive in the DDESS system would be compromised if a transfer occurred.

Installation Commander. The installation commander indicated that a transfer was perhaps inevitable in light of several other Department of Defense drawdowns and budget cutting efforts. He indicated that the success of a transfer was more dependent on the preparedness of the Beaufort County school district to accept the DDESS schools than on the readiness of the Laurel Bay facility to relinquish control. Specific concerns and comments follow.

Overcrowding. The installation commander is concerned that if the DDESS schools were transferred, they would become overcrowded. The LEA might attempt to alleviate overcrowding in its existing facilities by busing children to the on-base schools.

Busing. The commander noted that the local school district is very close to having to bus students to maintain racial balance. He is concerned that the Laurel Bay schools could be used to balance the racial makeup of the district. Another busing issue was raised concerning students who live on the neighboring military installations and attend school at Laurel Bay. The Commander is afraid these students would be assigned to LEA schools closer to their installations, rather than remain part of the “military family” at Laurel Bay schools.

Growth. The commander pointed out that the popularity of Hilton Head and other Beaufort County seaside resorts have made Beaufort the fastest growing county in the state. Local military personnel are also expected to increase as two additional military units are scheduled to be assigned to the Air Station as a result of base realignments and closures. Both types of growth will further strain Beaufort County’s ability to accept the Laurel Bay DDESS system and its 1,300 students.

DDESS School Board. The DDESS school board members who were interviewed for this study did not support transferring on-base schools to the local school district. They felt that the Laurel Bay staff and faculty are uniquely qualified to meet the special needs of military children and that a transfer would not be in the best interests of the children. DDESS school board members also believed that on-base parents do not want to lose the influence they have over their children’s education through the current process of school board elections and school board membership.

Board members also feared that the high quality of education that the Laurel Bay students receive would be compromised if a transfer occurred. Lower test scores and overcrowded schools were cited as examples of less favorable conditions in the local school system.

LEA Positions

Beaufort County officials believe their schools are improving in quality. The Beaufort County school district is heavily involved in educational reform at the district level. County officials cited recent district standards for core subject areas; the introduction of criterion-referenced testing procedures; and the implementation of site-based management, multi-age groupings, and individual school technology plans.

LEA officials indicated that two major issues would need resolution before the county could accommodate a transfer:

- The school district would require exclusive access to or ownership of the two school buildings on the base. The Beaufort County school district is growing by 400 students per year. This growth is currently being met through the use of portable classrooms. For school year 1995-96, Beaufort County required 100 portable classrooms. In Spring 1995, a building referendum was passed that will allow the construction of sufficient facilities to meet projected growth requirements through the year 2000. Even with these resources in place, county officials anticipate that taking over the Laurel Bay DDESS system would require the construction of a new high school near the base. Resources to construct the new high school are currently not available nor have they been included in any county planning documents. The county would also reserve the right to bus students—either from the county to installation schools, or from installation housing to off-base schools—in order to alleviate overcrowding.
- The addition of 1,300 students to the Beaufort County school district would place a sizable burden on the county schools. County officials indicated that they would not be able to accept these students without a guarantee of significant remuneration. The district currently receives approximately \$250,000 in Impact Aid funds. However, county budget documents no longer list this as a revenue source, as the size of the grant payment has become too small and unpredictable in recent years. If a transfer were to take place, additional funding would have to be guaranteed, both to cover the initial transfer and the continued education of the DDESS students.

Summary

Interviews at Laurel Bay and the adjacent Beaufort County school district revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede the DDESS transfer to the Beaufort County LEA. These factors are similar to those found by previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflicts would arise.
- Although the Laurel Bay housing facility and most of the other military installations served by the Laurel Bay schools are closed facilities, Beaufort County school buses already have access to transport these installations' grade 7-12 students. Moreover, one of Laurel Bay's two DDESS facilities is located close to the installation perimeter; the school could be separated from the installation by moving the perimeter boundary.
- Beaufort County already educates a large number of military-connected students. They could build on this experience in a transfer.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Beaufort County may assign students to schools in ways that the installation personnel oppose. LEA officials reserved the right to bus off-base students to the Laurel Bay facilities in order to alleviate overcrowding in the county schools. These officials also might require

Laurel Bay students living on the neighboring military installations to attend LEA schools closer to their military housing location.

- Beaufort County would require supplementary funding; current Impact Aid funding is not sufficient to cover the additional costs of educating the on-base students. Beaufort County also would want additional funds to cover one-time increases brought about by the rapid rise in the total number of students.

Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center, Virginia

The Installation

The Dahlgren Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) is located along the Potomac River 53 miles south of Washington, DC, and 28 miles west of Fredericksburg, Virginia. This small military installation is located in King George County, Virginia. The installation has several tenant commands: the Naval Surface Warfare Center, the Naval Space Command, the AEGIS Training Center, and the Joint Warfare Analysis Center.

Established in 1918 as an ordnance test center and proving ground for the U.S. Navy, Dahlgren's present day mission is to provide a wide range of research, development, testing, and evaluation functions. These functions cover areas such as engineering and fleet support for surface weapons systems, surface ship combat systems, ordnance, mines, amphibious warfare systems, mine countermeasures, special warfare systems, and strategic systems. The mission of the installation requires Dahlgren to be a restricted access facility.

The Dahlgren NSWC includes 700 active-duty personnel and 1,300 family members. There are currently 125 family housing units (37 officer and 88 enlisted) located on the installation, with construction of 129 more units soon to be completed.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

In 1918, the Navy established the Dahlgren School to provide education for on-base children in grades 1 through 8. Older children (in grades 9-12) have always attended school in the King George County school district. The Dahlgren School became a Section 6 school in 1952.

The Dahlgren School has 158 students enrolled in pre-kindergarten through grade 8. Although this enrollment should increase to around 300 when the new housing on the installation is occupied, the school will remain the smallest DDESS system. The 28 high school students who currently live on Dahlgren are transported to the King George County high school by the county.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

As the only adjacent school district, King George County would be the LEA accepting responsibility for the education of the Dahlgren students. King George County operates a small school system consisting of one high school, one middle school, and two elementary schools. Table G.24 provides current enrollment statistics for the King George County schools.

King George County educates only 79 military-connected students; these students account for three percent of the district's enrollment. Accepting the on-base students would increase the county's military-connected enrollment to 237 students, or nine percent of the county's total enrollment. If the DDESS enrollment goes to 300 students as projected, the county's military-connected enrollment would increase to 379 students, or 11 percent of the county's enrollment.

Table G.24.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Dahlgren NSW

Student Group	King George County (4 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Students	28	1
Living On the Installation		
Living Off the Installation	51	2
All Other Students	2,272	97
Total Enrollment:	2,351	

Other Virginia LEAs adjacent to King George County also have military student enrollments, at least some of which are Dahlgren-affiliated students. Thus, the 79 military students in King George County include only part of the Dahlgren-affiliated military students being educated in the local communities. This enrollment pattern means that this county educates fewer than one-third of all Dahlgren-affiliated military students. (An exact percentage cannot be provided because enrollment statistics from the other surrounding LEAs are not available.)

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Individual interviews were conducted with the DDESS superintendent, the installation commander, and the superintendent of the King George County schools. Discussions were also held with Dahlgren school teachers and parents.

Installation Positions

None of the installation-affiliated interviewees favored a transfer of the Dahlgren School to King George County. Their comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent did not feel that a transfer was feasible at this time. She indicated that the students living on the installation receive a higher quality education, with more resources available to them, than would be available if the school were transferred to the LEA. In addition, she noted that the Dahlgren School provides pre-kindergarten four days per week; King George County provides a pre-kindergarten only to at-risk students.

Installation Commander. The installation commander noted that due to the unique mission of the installation, Dahlgren is a secure installation. If the responsibility for educating on-base children were transferred to King George County, the Dahlgren school facilities would not be available to King George County. (The installation school buildings would be converted to much needed office space.) Furthermore, it would be difficult to provide daily access to the LEA to transport students off the installation.

Overall, the installation commander indicated that the Dahlgren School enhanced the quality of life for military families assigned to Dahlgren NSW and that this enhanced quality of life plays an integral part in the ability of the installation to perform its mission. Other issues raised by the commander are outlined below.

Recruitment. The research and development orientation of Dahlgren NSWC requires that it attract high quality, career Navy personnel. Such personnel are well-educated themselves and place a high priority on a competitive education for their children. There is a concern that the transfer of the installation school would place personnel in a position where family priorities would compete with military career decisions. Some of the attractiveness of a Dahlgren assignment would be lost.

Neighborhood School. All Dahlgren School students can walk or bike to school. The children do not have to lock their bikes at the school because of the high level of installation security. Many of the students go home for lunch. There is a fear that this “small-town” atmosphere would be lost if the school were transferred to King George County or if the DDESS school were closed.

Community Support. The Dahlgren School enjoys a high level of community support. The engineers from the installation helped wire the school for a local area network (LAN), and the installation provides both a school nurse and technical support for computer hardware and software. In general, there is strong interaction between the installation and the Dahlgren School. This support would most likely be lost if the school were transferred.

DDESS Parents and Teachers. Parents and teachers felt that the Dahlgren School should remain separate from the King George County LEA. This group made several points to support their view.

Both parents and teachers felt that a transfer would compromise the quality of education currently received by the students living on the installation. The combination of readily accessible teachers, smaller classes, and greater resources (particularly computers) provides an education experience that could not be matched by the King George County schools.

They also believe that LEA schools do not have the necessary experience or resources (testing, counseling, placement services, etc.) to accommodate the transient nature of military students.

Parents and teachers feel that parent participation is critical to the success of the Dahlgren School. The Dahlgren School welcomes parents as volunteers, and programs exist to encourage parent involvement. Because the installation population is well-educated and has such a strong scientific background, many parents are invited to share their experiences as guest lecturers. The parents living on the installation did not feel that King George County would necessarily encourage this level of parent participation. Greater travel distances to the LEA schools would also contribute to the detriment of such programs.

LEA Positions

The superintendent of King George County schools indicated that current overcrowding in county schools would not support an immediate transfer of the Dahlgren School. The county is experiencing a moderate level of growth. Pre-kindergarten through grade 8 are currently the most overcrowded grades. To help alleviate overcrowding, King George County is of building a replacement for one of its two elementary schools. Long-range projections include constructing a new high school and relocating the current middle school to the old high school building. County officials feel that when these building projects are completed in five years, a transfer would be more feasible.

The superintendent also noted that funding is a major concern regarding the transfer of the Dahlgren School. Impact Aid funding is currently perceived as unreliable and insufficient. A reliable source of long-term funding would have to accompany the transfer in order for King George County to

be able to educate all on-base children. Additionally, staff salaries are not comparable; DDESS teachers are better paid. Finally, some provision would have to be made for those Dahlgren teachers hired by the county to buy into the King George County (Commonwealth of Virginia) retirement system without substantial financial penalty.

Summary

Data collection at Dahlgren and the adjacent King George County LEA revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the Dahlgren School to the LEA. These factors are similar to those found by previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflicts would arise.
- Although the Dahlgren NSWC is a closed facility, King George County school buses already have access to transport on-base students to and from the LEA high school. Thus, access to bus the younger students could be negotiated.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- The Dahlgren NSWC commander does not support releasing control of the DDESS facility. The loss of this facility will make it more difficult for the LEA to absorb the on-base students.
- King George County Schools are overcrowded and not prepared to accept responsibility for the additional Dahlgren students. A five-year phase-in plan would be necessary to transfer all on-base students to the LEA.
- King George County would require supplementary funding to accept the additional on-base students. The LEA does not consider current Impact Aid funding levels to be sufficient to cover the added costs of educating the on-base students.

Quantico Marine Corps Base, Virginia

The Installation

First established in 1917 as a World War I training camp, Quantico Marine Corps Base (MCB) continues its mission as the headquarters for the Marine Corps Combat Development Command. Quantico is the primary location for many types of officer training—the Officer Candidate School, the basic school for officers, the Amphibious Warfare School, and the Command and Staff College. In addition, it offers courses in communications, computer sciences, management, and a course for noncommissioned officers. Because of this training focus, many Marine officers have more than one assignment at Quantico during their careers.

Quantico MCB is an open base located in Prince William and Stafford Counties, Virginia. The installation is approximately 30 miles south of Washington, DC. The base population includes 6,882 active-duty personnel and 4,320 family members. There are approximately 1,500 family housing units (542 officer and 1,019 enlisted) located on the installation.

Defense Domestic Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)

An on-base school was established at Quantico in 1919, two years after the base was founded. This school originally provided education for students in grades 1-7. The school was funded through donations, tuition, proceeds from the post exchange, and fund raising. In the 1930s, grades 8-11 were added to the system; grade 12 was added in 1944. Quantico is now one of four DDESS systems offering education for students in kindergarten through grade 12.

The on-base schools became Section 6 schools in 1953. Shortly after this, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare exerted pressure to merge the Quantico schools into the Prince William County education system. Resistance on the part of base parents and the Marine Corps leadership resulted in passage of the “Quantico Amendment” (amendment to Subsec. (a), Public Law No. 874-81; 20 U.S.C. § 241, August 1955). This legislation requires the prior approval of the relevant Service Secretary (in addition to the Secretary of Defense) before a DDESS school can be transferred to an LEA.

As shown in Table G.25, enrollment in the five Quantico DDESS schools includes 1,301 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. These 1,301 students constitute 18 percent of the 7,322 military-connected students in the local area (some of whom have parents assigned to other nearby installations). School enrollment has remained stable over the last several years and is not expected to change significantly, as there are no current plans to construct additional on-base housing.

Table G.25.
Enrollment in DDESS Schools at Quantico Marine Corps Base

School	Sep. 1995 Enrollment
Ashurst Elementary School (K-3)	256
Burrows Elementary School (PK, 4-5)	343
Russell Elementary School (K-3)	276
Quantico Middle School (6-8)	244
Quantico High School (9-12)	182
Total enrollment:	1,301

Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

Quantico MCB includes land in both Prince William and Stafford Counties. However, because the on-base housing and DDESS schools fall within the jurisdictional boundaries of Prince William County, that LEA that would be the only LEA eligible to receive the Quantico school system.

Prince William County is one of Virginia's largest school districts. The district is experiencing extraordinary growth because of its proximity to Washington, DC. The school district is currently growing by approximately 1,000 students (2%) per year. Table G.26 presents enrollment statistics for the Prince William County LEA.

Table G.26.
Enrollment of School District Adjacent to Quantico Marine Corps Base

Student Group	Prince William County (67 schools)	
	Number	Percent
Military Living On-Base	35	0
Military Living Off-Base	5,986	14
All Other Students	36,511	86
Total Enrollment:	42,532	

Prince William County currently educates 35 special education students living on the Quantico installation. These 35 students are transported to and from their homes by Prince William County.

There are several military installations located in the vicinity of Quantico; therefore, it cannot be assumed that all 5,986 of the off-base military-connected students who attend school in Prince William County have a parent assigned to Quantico MCB. It also cannot be assumed that Prince William County educates all the off-base Quantico dependents since the adjacent Stafford County enrolls 1,609 off-base military students. Nonetheless, 14 percent of Prince William County's students are military-connected, and the county educates 67 percent of all local military-connected students (including those enrolled at the DDESS schools, in Prince William County, and in Stafford County). Adding the 1,301 Quantico students to Prince William County's student enrollment would increase its total enrollment by only three percent. The proportion of military-connected students enrolled in the county would increase from 14 percent to 17 percent.

Perspectives on the Transfer of DDESS Schools to the LEA

Individual interviews were conducted with the superintendent of the Quantico DDESS system, a representative of the Quantico MCB commander, and the superintendent of Prince William County. Group discussions were held with members of the Quantico DDESS school board.

Installation Positions

All representatives of the Quantico MCB and DDESS schools were against transferring the Quantico schools to Prince William County. Specific comments are summarized below.

DDESS Superintendent. The DDESS superintendent indicated that the students in the Quantico school system receive a very high-quality education in an environment that could not be equaled in the LEA. The DDESS schools receive strong support from the military installation and have high levels of parent involvement. The superintendent felt that the DDESS schools are a true neighborhood school system with many community activities (e.g., Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, vacation church school, and youth athletic programs) supported by its facilities.

The DDESS schools have very small class sizes, particularly at the high school level. (The 1996 graduating class had 30 students.) The superintendent noted that this provides a special benefit to college-bound students who can get individual attention and progress at their own pace. The superintendent did indicate, however, that the small classes do limit the options available to students who are not interested in attending college. For example, it is difficult for a high school the size of Quantico High to provide a wide variety of (if any) vocational courses.

Installation Command. The representative of installation command indicated that the DDESS schools are perceived as a quality-of-life benefit for the military sponsors and their families who are assigned to the base. The commander's representative noted that the DDESS schools help instill a sense of community in the highly structured environment of a military installation. The loss of the schools could be viewed as a further erosion of promised benefits and, in turn, could negatively affect military career decisions.

DDESS School Board. DDESS school board members raised several issues concerning parental representation and expectations, school assignment, the future of DDESS employees, and ownership of DDESS facilities.

DDESS board members pointed out that Quantico parents currently have a strong voice in the education of their children, achieved by serving on the DDESS school board or by participating in school board elections. They also noted that DDESS school board members, administrative staff, and faculty are sensitive to the special needs of military children—needs that they feel would go unnoticed in the large Prince William County LEA.

If the DDESS facilities were transferred to the Prince William County LEA, the board questioned whether arrangements could be developed for the many community activities that use the buildings during non-school hours. Citing the transfer experience at the nearby Fort Belvoir schools to Fairfax County, the board cautioned that ownership and maintenance responsibilities would have to be carefully established and documented. (The Fort Belvoir schools were initially leased to Fairfax County. Without ownership of the Fort Belvoir buildings, Fairfax County could not legally expend public funds on major capital improvements. The Federal government provided no major capital funds. As a result, the buildings deteriorated to the point where in excess of \$10 million was required to correct building code violations.)

The DDESS school board was unanimous in the position that in any transfer decision the priorities must be (a) the needs of the on-base children and (b) whether the local school district could provide these children with a suitable education. The board also emphasized the need to insure that DDESS employees were treated fairly and were adequately compensated.

LEA Positions

If the Quantico schools were transferred, the Prince William County school district could easily absorb the relatively small number of students (1,301). The Prince William County superintendent indicated that the on-base schools would most likely remain neighborhood schools through the middle school level. At the same time, the LEA superintendent also indicated that assigning Quantico High School students to a school off the base would have to remain an option.

The Prince William superintendent agreed that any transfer decision should focus on serving the best interests of the military students and their parents. To facilitate the transition, several factors would require resolution:

- Prince William County would require full title and maintenance responsibility of all DDESS buildings.
- Concerns were raised about the adequacy of Federal Impact Aid to compensate the Prince William County school district for the cost of educating the additional Quantico children.
- In anticipation that many of the DDESS staff would be offered employment opportunities with Prince William County, some personnel issues (e.g., salary, seniority, benefits, and retirement) would have to be reconciled.

Summary

Interviews at the Quantico Marine Corps Base and the adjacent Prince William County school district revealed several factors that would facilitate or impede a transfer of the Quantico DDESS to Prince William County. These factors are similar to those found by previous studies (GAO, 1986; Purnell et al., 1991) and are summarized below.

Factors Facilitating Transfer

- Since there is only one LEA for transfer consideration, no jurisdictional conflict would arise.
- Prince William County is one of the largest school districts in Virginia and could easily absorb the relatively small number of Quantico students.
- Quantico is an open base so there would be no problems with the LEA gaining access to the on-base students or facilities.
- Most of the Quantico students (those in grades PK-8) could remain in on-base schools, preserving the neighborhood school system for these students.

Factors Impeding Transfer

- Quantico High School students may be assigned to an off-base high school.

APPENDIX H

STATE INTERVIEW REPORTS

Alabama State Department of Education

Three of the 15 military installations that have DDESS systems to be considered for transfer are located in Alabama. Table H.1 presents enrollment data for these three DDESS systems and for the adjacent Alabama LEAs that could assume responsibility for the DDESS students in these systems if a transfer were to occur.¹

Table H.1.
Enrollments in Alabama DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total	
Fort McClellan				
DDESS (K-6)	383	0	383	383
Calhoun County	51	731	782	10,270
Anniston County	57	302	359	3,872
Jacksonville City	56	222	278	1,516
Subtotal	547	1,255	1,802	16,041
Fort Rucker				
DDESS (PK-6)	1,102	0	1,102	1,102
Dale County	0	40	40	2,458
Coffee County	0	33	33	1,741
Daleville	159	227	386	1,495
Ozark	67	320	387	3,270
Enterprise	146	953	1,099	5,130
Subtotal	1,474	1,573	3,047	15,196
Maxwell AFB				
DDESS (K-6)	450	0	450	450
Montgomery County	448	1455	1903	35,065
Subtotal	898	1455	2353	35,515
All DDESS Sites				
All installations with DDESS	1,935	0	1,935	1,935
All adjacent LEAs	984	4,283	5,267	64,817
Total	2,919	4,283	7,202	66,752

The Fort McClellan, Fort Rucker, and Maxwell AFB DDESS systems educate 1,935 students (all grade K-6 students from the three installations). Thus, these three DDESS systems educate 27 percent of the 7,202 military-connected students educated by these systems and their adjacent LEAs. Fifty-nine percent ($n=4,283$) of the publicly educated, military-connected students affiliated with these installations live off the installations and are educated by the adjacent LEAs. The remaining 14 percent ($n=984$) of the publicly educated, military-connected students live on an installation and attend LEA schools.² If all three DDESS systems were transferred to the public schools, 41 percent ($n=2,919$) of the

¹ All data shown in this appendix are for the most recent school year for which data were available. LEA and state enrollment data in all tables are school year 1994-95 enrollment figures from the U.S. Department of Education report DHSC8772, *Impact Aid Program, Section 3 Recipient Districts* (March 11, 1996). All DDESS data are school year 1995-96 enrollments from the DoD *DDESS Directory of Schools, School Year 1995-1996*.

² The percentages reported in this paragraph are based on the number of students educated by the DDESS systems and by the adjacent LEAs that could assume responsibility for these students in the event of a transfer. The true

military-connected students in these areas would live on an installation and attend LEA schools (assuming all students chose to attend public schools). The site-visit summaries in Appendix G provide data on current and post-transfer enrollments *within* each potential recipient LEA (for Alabama LEAs and for LEAs in the remaining seven states with DDESS systems).

Table H.2 presents enrollment statistics for all LEAs in Alabama, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. Alabama currently educates 7,798 military-connected students, accounting for 2.0 percent of the state's total public-school enrollment. If these DDESS systems were transferred to Alabama public schools, the percentage of the state's total enrollment consisting of military-connected students would increase to 2.4 ($n=9,733$).

An important consideration for the state and its LEAs is whether military-connected students educated in the public schools live on a military installation. Families of students living on installations do not pay the property taxes that help support local public schools. As a result, localities are not fully reimbursed for the education of these students (unless funding is provided from another source). Currently, 24 percent ($n=1,847$) of Alabama's publicly educated military-connected students reside on an installation. If all the DDESS students from Fort McClellan, Fort Rucker, and Maxwell AFB were transferred to Alabama schools, the number of state-educated students living on military installations would increase to 3,782, or 39 percent of military-connected enrollments. The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that consists of military-connected students who live on a military installation would increase from 0.5 to 0.9. (Both increases assume all DDESS students would enroll in the public schools.)

Table H.2.
Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in Alabama Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current statewide total	1,847	0.5	5,951	1.5	7,798	2.0	397,081
Enrollments under a transfer							
From current DDESS sites	1,935		0		1,935		1,935
Transfer statewide total	3,782	0.9	5,951	1.5	9,733	2.4	399,016

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

According to the interviewed state education official, the state of Alabama acknowledges a responsibility to educate all children residing within the state, regardless of whether or not the children live on a military installation.

The official representing the Alabama state department of education would not take a position on the transfer of the DDESS schools at Fort McClellan, Fort Rucker, and Maxwell AFB. The official did say, however, that the state would contribute its share of the PPE to the recipient LEAs if the

percentages may differ from the reported values because (a) some students affiliated with these installations may be educated in other LEAs in the state and (b) some military-connected students in these three LEAs may be affiliated with other installations. A similar caveat applies to the percentages presented for DDESS systems and LEAs in the remaining seven states.

responsibility for educating the DDESS students were transferred to the public schools. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all Alabama LEAs. No additional money would be provided to the recipient LEAs to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available for educating the DDESS students. The LEA would have to accept the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues.

Potential Transfer Issues

Although the interviewed Alabama education official would not state a position on transferring the DDESS schools, the official raised a number of issues that would have to be resolved if a transfer were to occur.

Because of the number of students involved and the impact of a transfer on the recipient LEAs, the interviewed official stated that considerable lead time would be required to insure the LEAs are ready to accept the additional students. To insure a smooth transition, this advanced planning and lead time would have to include the receipt of funds in addition to Impact Aid. Ownership of the existing DDESS school facilities would be desired but not mandatory. The state would not commit any funds to the maintenance and up-keep of buildings which it did not own.

According to the state official, the hiring of teachers from DDESS schools should not pose a significant problem. If the DDESS facilities were used, the state presumes that DDESS faculty would have employment opportunities with the receiving LEAs. Some administrators, however, might need to transfer to other LEAs. The disparity between state and DDESS salaries would require negotiations with the LEA. DDESS teaching experience (which affects salary levels) would transfer to the LEA; however, tenure (which affects retirement benefits) would not. Legislation would be required to allow the current DDESS teachers to buy into the LEAs' retirement plans.

Representation of military parents on local school boards may not be possible. In Alabama, some school board members are elected and others are appointed. Both elected and appointed members must meet state residency requirements. The state recognizes that the transient nature of military service may preclude military members from remaining in an area long enough to gain sufficient recognition to be appointed, or sufficient voter support to be elected, to local school boards.

Financial assistance from the Federal government would be desired to help relieve the burden of educating the current DDESS students. At the same time, the state official reiterated that the state of Alabama recognizes a responsibility to educate all children living in the state. The official further stated that Alabama will meet this responsibility regardless of the Federal government's contribution.

Georgia State Department of Education

Three of the 15 military installations that have DDESS systems are located in Georgia. Enrollment data for these three DDESS systems and their adjacent LEAs are provided in Table H.3.

Table H.3.

Enrollments in Georgia DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total	
Fort Benning				
DDESS (K-8)	3,164	0	3,164	3,164
Chattahoochee County LEA	0	27	27	461
Muskogee County LEA	540	3,064	3,604	29,677
Subtotal	3,704	3,091	6,795	33,302
Fort Stewart				
DDESS (K-6)	1,663	0	1,663	1,663
Liberty County LEA	554	2,799	3,353	8,634
Subtotal	2,217	2,799	5,016	10,297
Robins AFB				
DDESS (K-6)	890	0	890	890
Houston County LEA	386	1,049	1,435	15,883
Subtotal	1,276	1,049	2,325	16,773
All DDESS Sites				
All installations with DDESS	5,717	0	5,717	5,717
All adjacent LEAs	1,480	6,939	8,419	54,655
Total	7,197	6,939	14,136	60,372

The three DDESS systems in Georgia educate 5,717 students. Thus, these DDESS systems educate 40 percent of the 14,136 publicly-educated, military-connected students from these installations and their surrounding LEAs. Forty-nine percent ($n=6,936$) of the military-connected students from these installations live off the installations and attend LEA schools. Only 10 percent ($n=1,480$) of the military-connected students from these installations reside on an installation and attend an LEA school. If all three DDESS systems were transferred to state and local control, 51 percent ($n=7,197$) of the military-connected students at these sites would live on an installation and attend LEA schools.

Table H.4 presents enrollment statistics for all LEAs in Georgia, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. Georgia currently educates 22,110 military-connected students; these students account for 3.7 percent of the state's total enrollment. If these three DDESS systems were transferred to the state, the percentage of the state's enrollment that consists of military-connected students would increase to 4.7 ($n=27,827$).

Currently, 18 percent ($n=3,900$) of the state's military-connected students reside on an installation. If all three DDESS systems were transferred to Georgia public schools, that figure would increase to 35 percent ($n=9,617$). The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that consists of students living on a military installation would increase from 0.7 to 1.6.

Table H.4.
Current and Post-Transfer Enrollments in Georgia Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current statewide total	3,900	0.7	18,210	3.1	22,110	3.7	591,654
Enrollments under a transfer:							
From current DDESS sites	5,717		0		5,717		5,717
Transfer statewide total	9,617	1.6	18,210	3.0	27,827	4.7	597,371

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

According to the interviewed state education official, the state of Georgia believes that the Federal government is responsible for educating military-connected students living on military installations. This conclusion includes the education of all locally residing military-connected students whose parents are not Georgia residents. Georgia assumes full responsibility for educating the children of military personnel who have established themselves as citizens of the state of Georgia.

The Georgia state education official was neutral on the issue of a transfer of the DDESS schools to their adjacent LEAs. The official did say, however, that if a transfer were to take place, the state would *not* contribute its share of the PPE for LEAs that assume responsibility for educating the DDESS students. Further, no additional state money would be provided to the recipient LEAs to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available to them. The LEAs would have to assume the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local or state tax revenues.

Potential Transfer Issues

When considering a potential transfer, the state official had a number of concerns. First, financial support from the Federal government was an important issue. In addition to desiring initial transition funding, the Georgia official stated that sustained Federal funding for the current DDESS students would have to be provided at an amount equal to the state contribution to the per-pupil expenditure. In addition, funds would be required to offset increased student transportation costs.

Ownership of the existing DDESS school facilities would be desired but not mandatory; the state would not commit any funds to the maintenance and up-keep of buildings that it did not own. There may be local requirements concerning facilities ownership that would need to be discussed with the LEAs. Additionally, all DDESS school facilities used by an LEA would have to comply with state codes. The costs to comply with these codes would be the responsibility of the Federal government. If the LEA did not own the buildings, costs to maintain the facilities within code requirements would also be a Federal government responsibility.

If the DDESS schools were transferred, the state official agreed that the recipient LEAs would need additional teachers. Although the DDESS staff would be a logical source from which to fill vacancies, the decision on who to hire would be left entirely to the LEAs. DDESS teachers would be required to obtain Georgia state certification before they could apply for any LEA position.

Military parent representation on local school boards would have to be accomplished within the current laws requiring state residency. Most local school boards in Georgia are elected by resident voters. The state official suggested that representation of military parents on local school boards might be achieved through the establishment of a (in most cases non-voting) military liaison.

Kentucky State Department of Education

Two of the 15 military installations that have DDESS systems are located in Kentucky. One of these installations is Fort Campbell, which occupies land in both Kentucky and Tennessee. Some or all of the Fort Campbell DDESS system could be transferred to an LEA in either Kentucky or Tennessee. This Kentucky state interview summary discusses transfer issues under the assumption that the Fort Campbell DDESS students would all be transferred to Kentucky. (The Tennessee summary—provided later in this appendix—assumes a transfer of all students to Tennessee.)

Enrollment data for the two Kentucky-based DDESS systems and their adjacent LEAs are provided in Table H.5. None of the military-connected students who reside on these installations attend public schools in Kentucky since both Fort Knox and Fort Campbell have K-12 DDESS systems. Thirteen on-post students at Fort Campbell attend school in Tennessee. Thus, these DDESS systems currently educate 7,974 of the 7,987 students who live on the installations. The Kentucky LEAs adjacent to these installations educate 3,254 military-connected students (all living off the installations), with an additional 4,370 educated in the Tennessee LEA adjacent to Fort Campbell. Counting both Kentucky and Tennessee enrollments from Fort Campbell, the two DDESS systems thus educate 51 percent of the publicly educated, military-connected students associated with these installations. Kentucky educates 21 percent of the publicly educated military-connected students associated with these installations (all of whom reside off the installations), while Tennessee educates 28 percent of these students (almost all residing off-installation). If both DDESS systems were transferred to Kentucky, this state would educate 11,241 military-connected students from the two installations—7,987 (71%) of whom would reside on an installation.³ (These last two figures include the 13 on-post Fort Campbell students currently educated in Tennessee.)

Table H.5.
Enrollments in Kentucky DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total	
Fort Campbell				
DDESS (PK-12)	4,297	0	4,297	4,297
Christian County	0	1,001	1,001	9,429
Subtotal	4,297	1,001	5,298	13,726
Fort Knox				
DDESS (PK-12)	3,677	0	3,677	3,677
Hardin County	0	1,981	1,981	12,037
Meade County	0	272	72	3,719
Subtotal	3,677	2,253	5,930	19,433
All DDESS Sites				
All installations with DDESS	7,974	0	7,974	7,974
All adjacent LEAs	0	3,254	3,254	25,185
Total	7,974	3,254	11,228	33,159

³ If the Fort Campbell DDESS students were transferred to an LEA in Tennessee, Kentucky would educate 6,931 military-connected students from these installations. Thirty percent of these students would reside on a military installation.

Table H.6 presents enrollment data for all LEAs in Kentucky, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. Kentucky currently educates 3,649 military-connected students; these students represent 1.7 percent of the state's total enrollment. If both DDESS systems were transferred to Kentucky, the percentage of the state's total enrollment that consists of military-connected students would increase to 5.3 ($n=11,636$).⁴

Currently, 0.2 percent ($n=10$) of the military-connected students educated in Kentucky public schools reside on an installation. If both DDESS systems were transferred to Kentucky, that figure would increase to 69 percent ($n=7,997$). The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that consists of students living on an installation would increase from less than one to 3.7.

Table H.6.
Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in Kentucky Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current statewide total	10	<0.1	3,639	1.7	3,649	1.7	209,862
Enrollments under a transfer:							
From current DDESS sites	7,987		0		7,987		7,987
Transfer statewide total	7,997	3.7	3,639	1.7	11,636	5.3	217,849

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

The state of Kentucky assumes that LEAs are responsible for educating military-connected students who live in the local community. The education of students who live on military installations is perceived to be the financial responsibility of the Federal government.

The Kentucky State Department of Education supports the transfer of DDESS schools currently located at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox to their adjacent LEAs. This support is conditioned on the appropriation of funding (both Federal and state) necessary to implement a transition, as well as on long-term financial support from the Federal government.

The state of Kentucky would contribute its share of the PPE to whichever Kentucky LEAs assumed responsibility for educating the DDESS students. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all Kentucky LEAs. No additional money would be provided to the recipient LEAs to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available to them. The LEAs would have to assume the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues.

⁴ If the Fort Campbell DDESS students were transferred to Tennessee, Kentucky's military-connected students would represent 3.0 percent of total enrollments; 58 percent of these military-connected students would reside on an installation.

Potential Transfer Issues

The interviewed Kentucky state education official raised a variety of logistical and legal concerns that would have to be addressed prior to a transfer of DDESS students to Kentucky public schools.

The availability of building and classroom space is the most significant issue the state has faced in educating military students. The state would expect the DDESS facilities to be part of any transfer arrangement. A fee simple title would be required for the state to have ownership of the installation schools and to assume responsibility for the maintenance of those facilities. Alternatively, the facilities could be leased to the LEAs for a nominal fee. If the installation facilities were turned over to the LEAs, the state would require Federal funds to cover the state's costs for facilities improvements and renovation during the initial transition period.

Kentucky currently spends \$150 million annually on student transportation. The influx of military students into the LEAs would increase transportation costs, necessitating additional financial assistance from the Federal government. Further, arrangements would need to be made to accommodate the buses, faculty, and staff who would need regular access to the military installations.

There is no legal provision for hiring DDESS teachers. Should a transfer take place, teachers at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox would be required to compete for LEA positions. State law would not permit a transfer of the salary or experience level of DDESS teachers to the LEAs.

A six-month residency requirement exists for parents to be eligible to run for positions on local school boards. However, military parents would be eligible immediately for positions on the site-based decision making council that exists at each Kentucky school.

Because of the number of students involved in a potential transfer and the impact on the recipient LEAs, the state would require considerable lead time to insure that LEAs are ready to receive the DDESS students. To insure a smooth transition, this advanced planning and lead time would have to include the receipt of funds in addition to Impact Aid. State officials preferred an approach that would hold the Federal government primarily responsible for the costs of the transition year. The state would increase its contribution to PPEs when appropriated funds became available at the state level. The Federal government's financial contributions would need to meet or exceed the state's contribution to the LEAs' per-pupil allocations.

New York State Department of Education

One military installation with a DDESS system—West Point, the United States Military Academy—is located in New York state. Table H.7 presents enrollment data for the West Point DDESS school and for the adjacent LEA that would assume responsibility for the DDESS students if a transfer were to occur.

Table H.7.

Enrollments in New York DDESS System and Adjacent LEA

DDESS System and Adjacent LEA	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total	
West Point				
DDESS (K-8)	725	0	725	725
Highland Falls LEA	165	0	165	1,060
Total	890	0	890	1,785

All personnel and family members stationed at West Point must reside on the installation. As a result, all military-connected enrollments associated with this installation are composed of on-base students. The West Point DDESS system educates 725 students in kindergarten through grade 8, while the local school district educates 165 (upper-grade) students who live on West Point. Thus, the DDESS system educates 81 percent of the publicly educated, military-connected students affiliated with West Point, and the state of New York educates 19 percent of these students. In the event of a transfer, the state would educate all 890 West Point students, with all students residing on the installation.

Table H.8 presents enrollment data for all LEAs in New York, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. New York currently educates 10,457 military-connected students, accounting for 0.9 percent of the state's total public-school enrollment. If a transfer of the West Point DDESS system were to occur, this figure would increase to 1.0 percent ($n=11,182$). The percentage of the state's military-connected student population that resides on an installation would increase from 51 to 54.

Table H.8.

Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in New York Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current statewide total	5,344	0.4	5,113	0.4	10,457	0.9	1,157,298
Enrollments under a transfer:							
From current DDESS site	725		0		725		725
Transfer statewide total	6,069	0.5	5,113	0.4	11,182	1.0	1,158,023

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

The state of New York assumes responsibility for educating military-connected students who live in the local community, or who live on a military installation but attend New York public schools. The state does not believe it has the authority to educate students in facilities on West Point. The land on which West Point is located was ceded to the Federal government. The New York State Department of Education does not recognize this land as part of the state of New York and thus assumes no authority or jurisdiction over it. The state does currently provide funding to the Highland Falls LEA for the education of upper-grade students who reside on West Point. Although these upper-grade students live on the installation, they attend school in Highland Falls.

The New York State Department of Education would not take a position on the transfer of the West Point DDESS school to the LEA. Significant legislative changes would be required before the New York Department of Education could accept legal responsibility to educate West Point DDESS students on the installation. If these changes were made, transfer issues could then be considered.

Potential Transfer Issues

As mentioned above, the New York State Department of Education does not recognize West Point as part of New York state and assumes no jurisdiction over it. In addition, current New York law prohibits an LEA from crossing jurisdictional boundaries to provide educational services. Because of these legal conditions, the state would require a legislative amendment in order to obtain authority to educate students in school facilities on West Point.

If West Point became part of its neighboring LEA, the state would contribute its share of the per-pupil expenditure to the education of students on the installation. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all New York LEAs. No additional money would be provided to the recipient LEA to offset the lower tax revenues available to it. The LEA would have to assume the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues. Any additional money necessary to offset the lower tax revenues would come from local revenues or other non-state sources.

The state would require local ownership of the school facilities located on West Point if these buildings were to be used by the LEA. Prior to transfer, all DDESS facilities would have to meet state construction codes and state policies regarding health, safety, and access. The Federal government would have to assume financial responsibility for any construction or renovation necessary to make the facilities acceptable.

Currently, there is no provision to guarantee the hiring of DDESS teachers by the LEA. Qualified West Point DDESS staff could apply for vacant LEA positions. Applicants would have to meet state certification requirements, and hiring would need to comply with the Fair Employment Act and New York State Civil Service Law. Salaries, benefits, and grade level would be determined on a case-by-case basis by the LEA.

Since West Point is not considered part of New York state, military personnel whose children attended school in the LEA would not have the option of running for positions on the local school board. Legislative changes would need to take place in order for this option to be available.

The interviewed state education official declined to comment on the anticipated Federal funding required to support a transfer. Instead, the official stated that arrangements regarding financial assistance should be determined by the LEA and the Federal government.

North Carolina State Department of Education

Two of the 15 military installations that have DDESS systems are located in North Carolina. Enrollment data for these two DDESS systems and their adjacent LEAs are provided in Table H.9.

Table H.9.
Enrollments in North Carolina DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students		Total	All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation		
Camp Lejeune				
DDESS (K-12)	3,505	0	3,505	3,505
Onslow County LEA	14	5,976	5,990	17,347
Subtotal	3,519	5,976	9,495	20,852
Fort Bragg				
DDESS (PK-9)	4,719	0	4,719	4,719
Cumberland County LEA	457	12,704	13,161	44,672
Subtotal	5,176	12,704	17,880	49,391
All DDESS sites				
All installations with DDESS	8,224	0	8,224	8,224
All adjacent LEAs	471	18,680	19,151	62,019
Total	8,695	18,680	27,375	70,243

The two DDESS systems in North Carolina educate 8,224 students. Thus, these DDESS systems educate 30 percent of the 27,375 publicly educated, military-connected students from Camp Lejeune, Fort Bragg, and their surrounding counties. Sixty-eight percent ($n=18,680$) of the military-connected students from Camp Lejeune and Fort Bragg live off the installations and attend LEA schools. Only 2 percent ($n=471$) of the military-connected students in these areas live on an installation and attend an LEA school. If both DDESS systems were transferred to the LEAs/state, 32 percent ($n=8,695$) of the military-connected students in these areas would live on an installation and attend LEA schools.

Table H.10 shows enrollment statistics for all LEAs in North Carolina, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. North Carolina currently educates 28,624 military-connected students; these students account for 5.4 percent of the state's total enrollment. If both DDESS systems were transferred to the state, the percentage of the state's total enrollment that consists of military-connected students would increase to 6.9 ($n=36,848$).

Currently, 13 percent of the military-connected students educated by the state reside on an installation. If both DDESS systems were transferred, that figure would increase to 33 percent. The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that lives on a military installation would increase from 0.7 to 2.2.

Table H.10.
Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in North Carolina Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students <i>n</i>
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current enrollments							
Current statewide total	3,771	0.7	24,853	4.7	28,624	5.4	529,011
Enrollments under a transfer:							
From DDESS installations	8,224		0		8,224		8,224
Transfer statewide total	11,995	2.2	24,853	4.6	36,848	6.9	537,235

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

The state of North Carolina assumes responsibility for educating military-connected students living in the local community. According to the interviewed state education official, the education of students who live on a military installation is viewed as the financial responsibility of the Federal government. This view is taken because the state does not accept responsibility for the education of children of out-of-state residents, which most on-base children are.

The North Carolina State Department of Education would oppose a transfer of the DDESS students at Camp Lejeune and Fort Bragg to their adjacent LEAs if the transfer created a hardship for the LEAs. The state's primary concern about a potential transfer is the provision of the financial assistance necessary to support a transfer. The North Carolina education official said the state would contribute its PPE share to whichever LEAs accepted responsibility for educating the DDESS students. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all North Carolina LEAs. No additional money would be provided to the recipient LEAs to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available to the LEAs. The LEAs would have to assume the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues to support that task.

Potential Transfer Issues

The North Carolina state education official stated that accommodating additional students would require the DDESS facilities. The official was unaware of any state laws that would affect the transfer of ownership of these facilities. The state official noted that any local requirements would need to be discussed with the LEAs. Additionally, should the LEAs assume responsibility for the DDESS facilities, state guidelines, regulations, and building codes would have to be met.

Regarding the employment status of DDESS teachers, the state official believed that the DDESS teachers could apply for any LEA position for which they were qualified, but there could be no guarantee of employment. All state employees are placed on an established salary schedule. Differences in DDESS and LEA salaries could only be corrected through financial supplements from the local governments. Teaching experience would most likely transfer to the recipient LEA, but tenure probably would not. Tenure decisions would be made by the LEAs.

Local school board members in North Carolina are selected through general elections. Military parents meeting state residency requirements could participate in school board elections, but there could be no other guarantee of representation.

The North Carolina state and local governments currently do not have the funds to pay for educating the DDESS students. The state anticipates that additional funds would be provided by the Federal government in an amount equal to the local share of the PPE for each student transferred.

South Carolina Department of Education

Two of the 15 military installations with DDESS systems are located in the state of South Carolina. Table H.11 presents enrollment data for these two DDESS systems and for the adjacent South Carolina LEAs that could become responsible for the DDESS students in the event of a transfer.

Table H.11.
Enrollments in South Carolina DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total	
Fort Jackson				
DDESS (PK-6)	1,034	0	1,034	1,034
Richland County Two	363	949	1,312	12,491
Subtotal	1,397	949	2,346	13,525
Laurel Bay				
DDESS (PK-6)	1,285	0	1,285	1,285
Beaufort County	258	922	1,180	12,714
Subtotal	1,543	922	2,465	13,999
All DDESS Sites				
All installations with DDESS	2,319	0	2,319	2,319
All adjacent LEAs	621	1,871	2,492	25,205
Total	2,940	1,871	4,811	27,524

The two DDESS systems in South Carolina educate 2,319 students (all on-base students in grades PK-6 at each installation). These two DDESS systems thus educate 48 percent of the 4,811 military-connected students educated by DDESS schools or the local public schools. Thirty-nine percent ($n=1,871$) of the publicly educated, military-connected students affiliated with these installations live off the installation and are educated by the adjacent LEAs. The remaining 13 percent ($n=621$) of the publicly educated, military-connected students live on an installation and attend LEA schools. If both DDESS systems were transferred to the local school districts, 61 percent ($n=2,940$) of the military-connected students in these areas would live on an installation and attend South Carolina public schools.

Table H.12 presents enrollment statistics for all LEAs in South Carolina, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. This state currently educates 17,392 military-connected students, accounting for 6.2 percent of the state's total public-school enrollment. If the Fort Jackson and Laurel Bay DDESS students were transferred to South Carolina public schools, the percentage of the state's total enrollment consisting of military-connected students would increase to 6.9 percent ($n=19,711$).

Currently, 32 percent ($n=5,495$) of South Carolina's publicly educated military-connected students reside on an installation. If all DDESS students from Fort Jackson and Laurel Bay were transferred to South Carolina public schools, the number of state-educated students living on military installations would increase to 7,814, or 40 percent of military-connected enrollments. The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that consists of military-connected students living on an installation would increase from 2.0 to 2.8.

Table H.12.
Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in South Carolina Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Current statewide total	5,495	2.0	11,897	4.2	17,392	6.2	281,640
Enrollments under a transfer:							
From current DDESS sites	2,319		0		2,319		
Transfer statewide total	7,814	2.8	11,897	4.2	19,711	6.9	283,959

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

The interviewed South Carolina state education official said that the state regards the education of students living on military installations as a joint responsibility of local, state, and Federal governments. Similarly, the education of military-connected students living in the local community is perceived to be a joint responsibility of the state and local governments.

The South Carolina state education official remained neutral on the issue of transferring the two DDESS school systems to LEAs within the state. Because the recipient LEAs would be most affected by a transfer, the state official expressed a strong desire for these LEAs to be involved in any decisions regarding the transfer of DDESS students.

The state official said the state would contribute its share of the PPE to LEAs if they assumed responsibility for educating the DDESS students. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all South Carolina LEAs. No additional money would be provided to recipient LEAs to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available to them. The LEAs would have to accept the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues. The state official believes that this situation could lower the quality of educational programs throughout the LEAs receiving DDESS students. The state expects that the Federal government would provide the LEAs with supplementary funds; however, a specific amount was not discussed.

Potential Transfer Issues

The state would require the receiving LEAs to own or lease the facilities included in a transfer. These facilities would have to meet South Carolina building construction codes and adhere to state and local policies regarding the use of educational facilities. If the facilities were not initially in compliance with state code and local policies, the requirements could be waived on a short-term basis until the necessary renovations or repairs were made. All initial repairs and renovations would be the financial responsibility of the Federal government.

Qualified DDESS instructional staff could be hired by the recipient LEAs. Salaries would be based on state-wide salary scales and payment schedules. The transfer of teaching experience and issues regarding tenure would have to be addressed by the recipient LEAs.

Representation of non-resident military parents on local school boards could not be accommodated. Military members who are South Carolina residents could vote in school board elections and campaign for available school board positions.

Because of the number of students that would be involved in a transfer and the potential impact on the recipient LEAs, considerable lead time would be required to insure the LEAs would be ready to receive the additional students. This advanced planning and lead time would have to include the receipt of sufficient funding, in addition to Impact Aid, to insure a smooth transition.

Tennessee State Department of Education

Tennessee has one military installation, Fort Campbell, with a DDESS system. A potential transfer of the Fort Campbell DDESS students is complicated by the fact that Fort Campbell covers land in both Kentucky and Tennessee. If the Fort Campbell DDESS system were transferred to an LEA in Kentucky, the only effect in Tennessee would be the potential loss of the few students (currently 13) who attend school in Montgomery County, Tennessee. (These students live in transient on-post housing that is physically located in Tennessee. However, if Kentucky were granted jurisdiction over all students on the installation, these students would also transfer to Kentucky public schools.) Since Tennessee currently has legal jurisdiction over part of the installation and could be granted full or partial jurisdiction over the DDESS students in the event of a transfer, Tennessee was included in the current study. This Tennessee interview summary discusses transfer issues under the assumption that the Fort Campbell DDESS students all would be transferred to Tennessee. (The previously provided Kentucky summary assumes a transfer of all DDESS students to Kentucky.)

Enrollment data for the Fort Campbell DDESS system and the adjacent Tennessee LEA are provided in Table H.13. Since the Fort Campbell DDESS system includes grades K-12, the DDESS schools currently educate virtually all (4,297, or over 99%) of the 4,310 students who live on the installation. Only 13 on-post students attend school in the Montgomery County, Tennessee, LEA. The Montgomery County LEA educates 4,357 military-connected students who reside off the installation; an additional 1,001 students affiliated with Fort Campbell reside in Kentucky and attend Kentucky public schools. The Fort Campbell DDESS system thus educates 44 percent of the 9,668 publicly educated, military-connected students associated with this installation. Tennessee educates 45 percent, and Kentucky 10 percent, of the military-connected students who live off the installation. Less than one percent of the Fort-Campbell-affiliated students who live on the installation attend Tennessee public schools. If the Fort Campbell DDESS system were transferred to Tennessee, this state would educate 8,667 military-connected students from this installation, 4,310 (50%) of whom would reside on the installation.⁵

Table H.13.
Enrollments in Tennessee DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total	
Fort Campbell				
DDESS (PK-12)	4,297	0	4,297	4,297
Montgomery County	13	4,357	4,370	17,442
Total	4,310	4,357	8,667	21,739

Table H.14 presents enrollment data for all LEAs in Tennessee, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. Tennessee currently educates 7,711 military-connected students, representing 1.7 percent of the state's total enrollment. If the Fort Campbell

⁵ If the Fort Campbell DDESS students were transferred to an LEA in Kentucky, Tennessee would educate only the off-post students who live in Tennessee. In this case, Tennessee would continue to educate 45 percent of the students affiliated with Fort Campbell, losing only the 13 students who reside in on-post transient housing.

DDESS system were transferred to Tennessee, the percentage of the state's total enrollment that consists of military-connected students would increase to 2.6 ($n=12,008$).

Currently, 12 percent ($n=914$) of the military-connected students educated in Tennessee public schools reside on an installation. If the Fort Campbell DDESS system were transferred to Tennessee, that figure would increase to 43 percent ($n=5,211$). The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that consists of students living on an installation would increase from 0.2 to 1.1.⁶

Table H.14.
Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in Tennessee Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current statewide total	914	0.2	6,797	1.5	7,711	1.7	463,961
Enrollments under a transfer:							
From current DDESS site	4,297		0		4,297		
Transfer statewide total	5,211	1.1	6,797	1.5	12,008	2.6	468,258

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

The state of Tennessee maintains the position that LEAs are responsible for educating military-connected students who live in the local community and that the Federal government is responsible for educating students who live on military installations. Although the state noted that changes in the criterion for Impact Aid funding for military students not living on an installation (Type B students) have recently lowered Impact Aid payments, the state has experienced no significant problems as a result of providing public education to military-connected students.

The interviewed Tennessee state education official said that the state would oppose a transfer of DDESS students at Fort Campbell to the adjacent LEA, unless both the current DDESS facilities and Federal fiscal support accompanied the transfer.

The Tennessee State Department of Education would contribute its share of the PPE to the Montgomery County LEA if it became responsible for the DDESS students. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all Tennessee LEAs. No additional money would be provided to the recipient LEA to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available to it. The LEA would have to assume the responsibility to educate an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues.

⁶ If the Fort Campbell DDESS students were transferred to Kentucky, Tennessee's military-connected enrollments would decline by 13 students. This transfer would produce no noticeable change in the three percentages discussed in these paragraphs (i.e., the percentage of total enrollments that are military-connected students, the percentage of military-connected enrollments that are students who reside an installation, or the percentage of total enrollments that are students who reside an installation).

Potential Transfer Issues

Because the state does not have funds to build new schools, a transfer of the DDESS students at Fort Campbell would necessitate ownership or an extended lease of the DDESS school facilities. The Federal government would be expected to provide funds for initial facilities maintenance and repair requirements. The official also noted that the Montgomery County LEA has limited transportation resources and that the state budget has no money allocated for new buses.

The state official believed that the salaries of DDESS teachers are typically higher than those of LEA teachers. DDESS teachers would probably be welcome to apply for positions that would become available in the recipient LEA; however, at this time, it could not be determined what salary scales or benefit programs would apply. Issues concerning the transfer of tenure and teaching experience would have to be discussed with the LEA.

The state official noted that the state and local governments currently do not have the requisite funds to educate the Fort Campbell DDESS students. Without additional funds, the LEA would have to educate an increased number of students with a lower level of per-student resources; this would lower the quality of educational programs throughout the LEA. The state official anticipates that, should a transfer occur, funds presently used by the Federal government to educate the military students at Fort Campbell would be allocated to the state and local governments.

Virginia State Department of Education

Two of the 15 military installations that have DDESS systems are located in Virginia. Enrollment data for these two DDESS systems and their adjacent LEAs are provided in Table H.15.

Table H.15.
Enrollments in Virginia DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs

DDESS Systems and Adjacent LEAs	Military-connected Students			All Students
	Living on the Installation	Living off the Installation	Total Military	
Dahlgren NSWC				
DDESS (K-8)	158	0	158	158
King George County LEA	28	51	79	2,351
Subtotal	186	51	237	2,509
Quantico				
DDESS (PK-12)	1,301	0	1,301	1,301
Prince William County	35	5,986	6,021	42,532
Subtotal	1,336	5,986	7,322	43,833
Grand Totals				
All Installation with DDESS	1,459	0	1,459	1,459
All adjacent LEAs	63	6,037	6,100	44,883
Total	1,522	6,037	7,559	46,342

The two DDESS systems in Virginia educate 1,459 students. Thus, these DDESS systems educate 19 percent of the 7,559 publicly educated, military-connected students from Dahlgren, Quantico and their surrounding communities. Eighty percent ($n=6,037$) of the military-connected students from these installations live off the installation and attend LEA schools. Only one percent ($n=63$) of the military-connected students in these areas live on an installation and attend an LEA school. If both DDESS systems were transferred to the LEAs/state, 20 percent ($n=1,522$) of the military-connected students in these areas would live on an installation and attend LEA schools.

Table H.16 presents enrollment data for all LEAs in Virginia, including military-connected students from *all* military installations in the state. Virginia currently educates 74,908 military-connected students, constituting 11.2 percent of the state's total public school enrollment. If both DDESS systems were transferred to the state, the percentage of the state's total enrollment that consists of military-connected students would increase to 11.4 ($n=76,367$).

Currently, 18 percent ($n=13,604$) of the military-connected students educated in Virginia public schools reside on an installation. If both DDESS systems were transferred, that figure would increase to 20 percent ($n=15,063$). The percentage of the state's *total* enrollment that lives on a military installation would increase from 2.0 to 2.2.

Table H.16.
Current and Post-transfer Enrollments in Virginia Public Schools

Enrollments	Military-connected Students						All Students
	Living on an Installation		Living off an Installation		Total		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Current statewide total	13,604	2.0	61,304	9.1	74,908	11.2	670,358
Enrollments under a transfer							
From current DDESS sites	1,459		0		1,459		1,459
Transfer statewide total	15,063	2.2	61,304	9.1	76,367	11.4	671,817

Education of Military-connected Students and Transfer of DDESS

The state of Virginia perceives the education of military-connected students who live either on military installations or in the local community as a joint responsibility of state and Federal governments.

The state believes that it has experienced financial hardship as a result of providing public education for military-connected students. Because more than half of education revenues in Virginia comes from local sources and because military personnel contribute significantly less to the local tax base, educational expenses for military-connected students frequently outweigh financial resources.

The Virginia State Department of Education is opposed to the transfer of DDESS students at Dahlgren and Quantico to their adjacent LEAs. This decision derives from the state's current financial difficulties and from the expectation that a transfer would impose a number of burdens on the receiving LEAs. Nonetheless, if a transfer of the DDESS schools occurred, the state would contribute its share of the PPE to whichever LEAs accepted responsibility for educating these students. This share would be based on the same allocation rules that apply to all Virginia LEAs. No additional money would be provided to the recipient LEAs to offset the lower per-student tax revenues available to them. The LEAs would have to assume the responsibility of educating an increased number of students without a commensurate increase in local tax revenues to support the task.

Potential Transfer Issues

The Virginia LEAs that are potential recipients of DDESS students have stated that they would need the DDESS facilities. The state official felt that in lieu of requiring the LEAs to own the DDESS buildings, a leasing arrangement would be possible. The issue of ownership versus leasing would be the decision of LEA officials. The state official noted, however, that the state would not provide financial assistance for construction and renovation of buildings that an LEA did not own. In addition, state building codes and regulations (e.g., regarding radon levels) would have to be met before the DDESS facilities could be used by an LEA.

There are no provisions for the automatic hiring of DDESS staff. DDESS teachers who obtain Virginia state certification would be eligible to apply for vacancies in the LEAs. Individuals who were hired would have to accept the local school board salary scale and benefit packages. Other issues, such as the transfer of teaching experience and tenure, would need to be addressed by the LEAs.

There were no immediate solutions to the representation of non-resident military parents on local school boards. Although elected and appointed positions exist on local school boards, board members must be qualified voters who legally reside in the school board's jurisdictional county or city.

APPENDIX I

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)		2. REPORT DATE 14 Oct 1997	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final (28 Aug 95 -- 30 Sep 96)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Study of Schools Serving Military Families in the U.S.: Educational Quality, Federal Administration, and Funding			5. FUNDING NUMBERS C-DASWO1-94-H-0001 (DO No. 0004)	
6. AUTHOR(S) John Helmick (Westat) and Lisa Hudson (DMDC)				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Westat 1650 Research Boulevard Rockville, MD 20850-3129			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) Survey & Program Evaluation Division, 1600 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400 Arlington, VA 22209			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER 97-013	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The Conference Report on the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1995 directed the Secretary of Defense to examine military parents' opinions of the quality of education in (a) the Federally funded Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS) and (b) local education agencies (LEAs) in which over 30% of enrolled students are military connected. Two mail-out surveys were conducted in addition to interviews of installation, state, and local officials. The surveys were administered to over 40,000 active-duty service members between December 1995 and October 1996. This study found strong support for the current DDESS system among the parents of DDESS students, installation commanders, and DDESS personnel. Although they do not actively seek a transfer of DDESS schools to LEAs, state and local education officials are open to a transfer, as long as the Federal government provides sufficient funding. This study also found concerns that if transfers are required in the future, that they be carefully and strategically planned, and that no transfer be made without full funding of Impact Aid. LEAs with enrollments that are over 30 percent military-connected students reported problems resulting from funding levels below the level authorized by the Impact Aid statutes.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS active-duty education survey schools			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 274	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THE PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filing in each block of the form follow. It is important to ***stay within the lines*** to meet ***optical scanning requirements***.

Block 1. Agency Use Only(Leave blank).

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered. State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C - Contract	PR - Project
G - Grant	TA - Task
PE - Program Element	WU - Work Unit Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name.

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. (If known)

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in.... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement.

Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."
DOE - See authorities.
NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.
NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code

DOD - Leave blank
DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.
NASA - Leave blank.
NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief (Maximum 200 words) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code (NTIS only).

Block 17. - 19. Security Classification. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to

